The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1889.

The Week.

A LARGE amount of space is given in the report of the Secretary of War to the matter of desertions from the regular army, which has also been much discussed of late by military men in the magazines. Everybody who touches on the subject takes a somewhat different view of the causes of desertion. The Secretary says the principal ones are the restraints of discipline, disappointment with the details of the service, dissipation, ill treatment, and professional repeating. He thinks these can be overcome "to a considerable extent" by higher pay, by greater comfort, by more lenient punishments, and by giving the soldier opportunities of improving himself. It will be well to try these things, of course, and they may diminish the percentage of desertions somewhat, but they will probably never make it small. Desertions are nearly as numerous in the British Army as in ours. They are sure to be numerous in all armies recruited by voluntary enlistment. A good class of men cannot, in our day, be got to enter such armies in any great number in time of peace, if for no other reason, because they dislike their associates in the ranks. In armies filled by conscription, desertions are rare because all classes of the population are represented in the ranks, and every man finds congenial friends and associates, and most of them have homes in which they would be disgraced and caught if they ran away from the regiment. The men who enlist in our army and the British Army under present conditions are apt to be of the roving, restless kind, who object to steady occupation of any sort, have no great desire for "self-improvement," and, disliking restraints of every kind, naturally dislike those of military discipline. Life in Western posts, too, is dreary enough to inspire thoughts of desertion in the best constituted military mind. As long as we cannot get better material for the army, desertion will be a favorite pastime of the American soldier, especially out in the Plains. We may do something to diminish it, through such suggestions as the Secretary makes, but there will always be a great deal of it. Probably nothing disgusts a soldier more than such work as road-making and ditch-digging. The Roman soldier did a vast amount of it, but our soldiers are not Romans, and our world is not the Roman world, and probably many of the men enlist simply to avoid handling the spade and pickaxe.

The new Comptroller of the Currency (Mr. Lacey) makes a number of recommendations having in view the prolongation of the national-banking system. Most of these suggestions have been made by his predecessors, and reiterated until they have become tedious, without gaining the attention of Congress. The reason why they have fallen upon deaf ears is, that they look only to a brief extension of time for the bank-note circulation. They do not go beyond the year 1907, when the last outstanding bonds of the Government fall due. The integral and vital part of the present system is bond security. The system was called into existence by reason of the Government debt. Its philosophy, so far as note circulation is concerned, is interwoven with the debt, and when one goes out, the other must go out also. This is not saying that some other system may not be devised, national in character, but it will not be the present system. The other parts of the system—other than the circulating-note function—may be easily preserved, and ought to be. Upon this point the Comptroller recommends that the requirement that all banks keep a minimum of $50,000 of Government bonds be reduced to $30,000. Why not reform it altogether by simply providing that national banks which do not desire to issue circulating notes need not keep any bonds at all? The constitutional question which is sometimes raised, whether Congress can charter banks without the fiscal purpose of lending some portion of their capital to the Government, might then receive a solution through the courts, if anybody were minded to raise it. It would be interesting to know what would happen in case a national bank should continue to receive deposits and transact its ordinary business without having a petty deposit of bonds at Washington. This is something like the momentous question raised in the English Parliament: "What would happen if the Speaker should name a member?" We believe that the experiment was tried a few years ago in the case of an unruly Home-Ruler, and that the roof did not fall in. Probably neither the roof of the Treasury nor the heavens above our heads would fall if Congress should simply repeal that provision of law which Comptroller Lacey would like to have scaled down from $50,000 to $30,000.

If both the wool-growers and the silver men combine against Congressman Reed for the Speakership, it would seem to be the duty of all conservative Republicans to give him their support. We have never seen anything in Mr. Reed's course as regards the tariff question which entitles him to be classed as a reformer. He is as far from representing any views held by us as is Mr. McKinley or Mr. Burrows. But it may be fairly inferred from his surroundings that he would not favor the scale of increased duties on wool that was embodied in the Senate bill of the last Congress. In other words, he would probably follow the safe policy of letting the wool tariff stand as it is until more light can be obtained both as to its workings and as to the wishes of the majority of the people. If the Republican party can see its advantage in putting a prohibitory duty on carpet wool, the election of McKinley for Speaker of the House would be the right step to take. Then we shall probably hear from New England in no uncertain tones in the Congressional elections next year. If it is deemed best to make no dangerous experiments, Mr. Reed will be the better choice. The same ideas are applicable as regards the silver question. Here, too, Mr. Reed is a conservative, and we think that the Republican party as a whole are conservative. To change the standard of value, as is now proposed by the hot-heads, would bring consequences of a political sort that no one can now foretell. Probably Mr. Reed would use his influence as Speaker to prevent inconsiderate action, and to make sure what is on the other side of the hedge before jumping over it. One thing is certain: the Republican party has control of all the branches of the Government, and it will be held responsible for any detriment that the republic receives.

A reply which Mr. St. John has made to the criticisms of Mr. Knox on his silver proposals, strikingly illustrates the very imperfect acquaintance which many financiers of repute have as yet attained in respect to the silver question. For example, we find Mr. St. John saying that "the main feature to result from the enhancement of the price of silver is that we take away from Great Britain her inducement to depress silver, and we avoid free coinage of silver if this proposition be acceptable to those who defend free coinage; because free coinage would seem to put the United States where the Hindu now is, when Great Britain procures low-price bullion and coins it into the India legal-tender rupee with which to purchase India's products—India's mints being free for silver coinage, as some propose our mints shall be, except for her charge of seigniorage." And again: "When we enhance the price of silver, we tend to wrest from England her present advantage in importing India's wheat and cotton, and thereby we more abundantly supply her our product, until by and by the volume sent to England will be greater than her products returned to us will repay us for, whereupon at once we command her gold." How Great Britain could "depress silver" if she had a mind to do so, any more than she could depress wheat or cotton, must be left to conjecture. But so far is she from having any inducement to do so that the almost universal desire in that country is, that the former value of silver should be restored, provided that such a result can come about by natural agencies. There is not, furthermore, a particle of foundation for the assertion that "Great Britain procures low-price bullion, and coins it into the Indian legal-tender rupee with which to purchase India's products." Great Britain has never done any such thing; neither shall we, "by enhancing the price of silver, tend to wrest from England her present ad-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vantage in importing wheat and cotton," for England has no such advantage. Data recently published by the London *Economist*, and derived from official sources, tend to show that since 1884 the value of the rupee for exchange for wheat in India has fallen about 25 per cent.; and such a fall of itself invalidates pretty much all that has been written to prove that the fall in the price of silver has operated as a bounty upon the export of wheat from India. For if the silver rupee will not buy within 25 per cent. as much wheat as it once did, what becomes of the bounty?

It has turned out as we supposed it would: the high-tariff gentry are not willing to let go any part of the tax on pig-iron merely because we are shipping pig-iron to England. The *American Manufacturer and Iron World* holds that it would be very unphilosophical to throw off the duty, because such a step would be equivalent to an addition to our own producing capacity of all the producing capacity in the world. And what, it asks, would be the effect if our capacity of 6,000,000 tons were increased in one day to 25,000,000 tons, or even to 11,000,000? Would not stagnation and loss of employment and low wages be the result? We should say yes, if there were no market for pig-iron except the United States. But if there were a whole world to be supplied, and if the demand were such that all of the furnaces could not supply it without causing an advance in prices—such an advance as now exists, and which leads to the export of American pig to England—we should say that no stagnation or loss of employment or decline in wages would follow.

The tone of Gov. Hill's newspaper friends indicates that he is very anxious for a compromise upon the ballot-reform question. They are all advocating "mutual concessions," and are insisting that in passing the Saxton bill twice the Republicans of the Legislature had no other object than to put the Governor "in a hole." They say the time has come now to abandon this line and to meet the Governor half-way. That kind of talk would have more weight if the Saxton bill had not from the outset been almost entirely the work of ballot-reformers of both parties, who had no political or partisan designs upon the Governor or anybody else when they formulated the measure. Mr. Saxton and other Republicans took the bill mainly as it came from the hands of the reformers, and advocated it loyally, voting solidly for it at two sessions of the Legislature. Their bill was the inspiration and model of the Massachusetts law, and the complete success of that law vindicates them and leaves the Governor without a single valid excuse for his opposition and vetoes. It is preposterous to talk about concessions under such conditions, if by that term the abandonment of such vital principles as exclusive official ballots and nominations by petition are meant. It is not the duty of Republicans or reformers to make it any easier for the Governor to get himself out of the hole into which he was short-sighted enough to put himself.

Gov. Wilson of West Virginia has decided to call a special session of the Legislature in January, and among the business upon which he will recommend action will be the adoption of a ballot-reform bill. He has himself prepared a bill embodying the principles of the Australian system, which he will have introduced in the Legislature. There are few States more in need of this reform. West Virginia has for several years been a doubtful State, and the desire to carry it, especially in Presidential contests, has been calling forth steadily increasing outlays of money by both National Committees. The secret official-ballot system would go a long way towards breaking up this practice, if it did not completely put a stop to it.

Senator Blair of New Hampshire was so much surprised that the Virginians did not elect Mahone after he had been down and advised them to do so, that he went back to Washington saying that he was satisfied that there were enough Republican votes cast to give Mahone a good majority, and that the forty-odd thousand majority against him was due to fraud. The Republican newspapers of Virginia which refused to support Mahone, make short work of this ridiculous charge. The *Valley Virginian*, published at Staunton, in Augusta County, and the *Spirit of the Valley*, published at Harrisonburg, in Rockingham County, demonstrate that all through that region, where the negro vote is small, and everybody knows that the election was perfectly fair, there was a heavy falling-off in the Republican vote from last year—over one thousand in each of the counties mentioned, and several hundred in each of many other counties. "The result of the election," says the *Valley Virginian*, "was forecast long before the 5th of November. This was based upon known conditions and positive evidence of unappeasable dissatisfaction and opposition to the Norfolk ticket. So the cry of 'fraud,' as affecting the general vote, or as to the majority recorded, will not hold good."

The official returns in Virginia illustrate very clearly the extent of the revolt among Republicans against Mahone, and demonstrate the absurdity of the claim that the sweeping Democratic victory was due to fraud. The total vote proves to be nearly 291,000, or within about 12,000 of the unprecedentedly full poll in the last Presidential election. The vote for Governor will not be canvassed until the Legislature meets, but the returns for Attorney-General give the Mahone candidate only 122,681, against 166,978 for the Democratic, whereas last year Harrison had 150,438 to 151,977 for Cleveland. In other words, Mahone kept nearly 30,000 Republicans from supporting the Republican party this year, while about half of the number not only refused to support his ticket, but voted directly for the Democratic candidates. It is worth while to examine the figures from districts where not even the most blatant Mahonite has alleged any unfairness. The vote in four counties of the Shenandoah Valley and four in Southwest Virginia is nearly as large as last year, but the Republican total has sunk from 16,234 to 13,647, while the Democratic has increased from 15,634 to 17,206, transforming a Republican majority of 600 last year into a Democratic—or, rather, anti-Mahone—majority of 3,559 this year.

A Washington despatch reports that the Kentucky politicians in that city have been much moved by the appointment of Mrs. Goodloe, through her son-in-law, to the collectorship of internal revenue left vacant by her husband's death. One of them, Congressman Thomas, is reported to have "claimed" that the appointment would "thoroughly disorganize the Republican party in the State," and was therefore one not fit to be made, particularly as Mrs. Goodloe is reported to have been left in comfortable circumstances. How the party would be disorganized is not stated, but the assertion suggests curious reflections as to the kind of political party it must be which is disorganized by the appointment of a widow to a small office. What is it that keeps such a party together? What do its voters say to each other when they hear of the appointment which "disorganizes" them? Do they say that the news has completely changed their views about the tariff, or about negro suffrage, or steamer subsidies, or the fisheries question, or the silver question, or that they feel now that the party has no future, and that some newer and more vigorous organization, with clearer views about the Lexington Collectorship, must take its place? Nothing would be more interesting than an explanation in detail from a practical politician of the way in which a post-office or appraisership builds a party up, or brings it to defeat or ruin, as the case may be. It would be an absolutely new contribution to political science, and, in fact, would throw a side light on some of the more obscure workings of the human mind.

Another interesting question in connection with this appointment is what it indicates as to the President's view of the affair in which Col. Goodloe lost his life. If he lost it in simple defence against an unprovoked attack, his memory deserves honor and his family assistance from the Government. If he lost it, however, in a "collision" long expected, and for which he went prepared, and which he precipitated at the Post-office, he lost it when engaged in the perpetration of a crime. Even under these circumstances, his family deserve deep sympathy from his friends; but should a Government office be used to provide for them? Ought the President, as a professing Christian and the first officer of a great civilized community, therefore to have made the appointment without stating openly which of these two views of the manner of Col. Goodloe's death he took? This

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must be important in the eyes of those who wish to see Kentucky delivered from this horrible barbarism which makes it disgraceful to settle quarrels otherwise than with the knife or pistol. The ordinary Kentucky boy's view of the Swope-Goodloe encounter undoubtedly is, that it was a noble, manly affair, in which the combatants lost their lives creditably, if not gloriously. Will not this impression be strengthened, to the boy's moral and perhaps social damnation, by a seeming confirmation of it from the highest officer of the Republic, himself a church-communicant and Sunday-school teacher? Come, Mr. President, let us know exactly what you meant to express by this appointment, and also what Mr. Halford thinks about it, for he too gives instruction in Christian morals.

Mr. John Field, the new Postmaster of Philadelphia, has written a letter to the local Civil-Service-Reform Association which deserves the heartiest praise. After returning thanks for the courteous and complimentary letter which he had received from the officers of the organization, and saying that "it is due to the Administration to say that my membership in your body and my views in relation to the public service were fully known and understood before the position of Postmaster was tendered to me, and that I have not been asked to modify those opinions in any particular," he proceeds:

> "The existing postal rules and regulations adopted by the Civil-Service Commission and approved by President Harrison are more comprehensive and far-reaching than those under his predecessor, and embrace nearly all the positions occupied by employees in the Post-office. These rules and regulations, and the full spirit and purpose of the law, as I understand the same, shall be strictly observed and maintained. So far, therefore, as applies to these places, there will, during my administration, be no removals except for just and legal cause, and no appointment save in strict accordance with the law. As to the few positions to which the said rules and regulations do not apply, it is sufficient for me to say that changes will be made therein when, in my judgment, the efficiency of the service will be thereby promoted."

If Mr. Field lives up to this platform, the civil-service reformers of Philadelphia will have no occasion to regret the congratulations in which they have indulged upon his appointment.

Gov. Hill has commuted Giblin's sentence to imprisonment for life, and Giblin is, of course, overjoyed and looks forward to a speedy pardon. He tried to buy some pastry with a counterfeit five-dollar bill in the store of a poor German baker. The baker discovered the fraud, retained the bill, and refused to part with his pastry until paid with good money. Giblin insisted on getting possession of the bill, and, on the baker's trying to expel him from the store, fired four shots with a pistol, one of which mortally wounded the baker's wife and another dangerously wounded the baker himself. They were a young married couple, of excellent character. Giblin was carefully tried and found guilty of wilful murder. He went up to the Court of Appeals, where all his exceptions were examined and passed upon and the judgment on him confirmed and the day of his execution fixed. Gov. Hill then, for some unknown reason, reprieved him, and ordered not a reëxamination of the evidence laid before the jury by a competent legal adviser, but a new trial of the case by an obscure young lawyer without experience, at which the witnesses were examined over again, and fresh ones produced; and on the finding of this extraordinary referee the verdict of the jury of wilful murder has been overruled. No such court of appeal in criminal cases has ever been known in this or any other country, and its creation, of course, suggests irresistibly to the uncharitable the possession of a political "pull" of some kind by Giblin to which our worthy Governor is sensitive. This may not be the true explanation, but it is the one to which the remarkable way in which the case has been reconsidered naturally gives countenance, for the Governor publishes no reasons for his decision.

The thronging dangers of modern civilized life have been increased by the discovery in England of what may be called a social analogue of subway explosions and "dead" electric-light wires. Pending the trial of a case there, the Divisional Court has determined on demurrer that the committee or members of a club may be entitled to damages if the club be generally libelled; so that, for example, a gentleman being blackballed, and relieving his not unnatural vexation in contemptuous remarks about the membership, may be called to answer for it not in one action at law merely, but in as many actions as there are members of the club. In that aspect of it, the English decision seems only to increase the power and prestige of clubs, but if it shall become law in this country, another result will follow of peculiar felicity. It will make hard the way of newspapers of the baser sort which get a good part of their living by publishing picked-up or invented tattle about just such cases of blackballing and the like. Few things make better "copy" for the use of the lower-class newspapers than talk of this sort. Their readers are eager for it, though few of them ever have seen the inside of a club, for the same reason that they like to read the "society" notes—for the reason that would make anybody like to read an authentic account of a day in Mars; and any club-servant who overhears a proper bit of talk among his masters can find a market for it at a good price in the offices of some of the morning journals. These thereupon proceed to enlarge and diversify it, after their manner. The English decision would put an end to this: fifteen hundred libel suits at once, on the same matter, would constrain the most "enterprising" of our contemporaries.

The Anti-Slave-Trade Convention at Brussels is due chiefly to the indefatigable labors of Cardinal Lavigerie, who has made the suppression of the African slave traffic his life-work. Whether any immediate practical results will be achieved is doubtful, but none the less ought the Convention to be held and the propaganda to be pushed and the agitation kept alive. The obstacles in the way are not so much the indifference of the governments of civilized States, for they are not indifferent. They share the views of Cardinal Lavigerie and his fellow-workers abundantly. The obstacles are those which nature itself opposes to all the undertakings of the white man in Central Africa, viz.: distance, climate, disease, want of communications, etc. A march of 1,000 miles across equatorial ranges of hill and plain, without roads, is not an uncommon one for a slave gang, and it is of little concern to the slave-traders if four-fifths of their victims perish on the way. No force of civilized men can take the risk of pursuing these villains to their headquarters. They can only make the attempt to intercept them at some point on the Nile, or at the coast, or on the sea. The slave dhow does not need any harbor to sail from. Any point along the coast will answer for its starting-point. But all points cannot be guarded. Moreover, the native officials along the upper Nile are sure to be in the pay of the slave-dealers, and to connive at their escape from the European officers appointed to intercept them. There seems to be no way of attacking the evil in the Sudan except by following Sir Samuel Baker's plan, with the difference, however, of employing Europeans instead of native officers and soldiers. But this involves enormous expense. It is really making war on a large scale at a great distance from one's base, and at great risk of the lives of men. It is not to be expected that England will take this burden upon herself merely because she holds lower Egypt. But she will be in the forefront, no doubt, as she always has been, in steps to suppress this traffic, than which nothing more execrable was ever known in the history of the human race.

The glimpses we get of Dr. Emin from Stanley's letters are not encouraging to those who had hoped that a lamp of civilization might be lighted in Central Africa which would replenish itself and continue to burn without the constant presence of the Doctor himself or other Europeans. So far is this result from being achieved that we learn now, and not for the first time, that Dr. Emin has been in constant danger of his life from his own militia, and it seems quite certain that, now he has departed, his meritorious plan of civilization will fall into ruin. The more information we gain from Central Africa, the more are we convinced that the lifting of the Dark Continent from barbarism can be accomplished only gradually, from the coast inwards, as the civilization of the American Continent was achieved. And perhaps it will only be gained by the slow extermination of the savages. A people addicted to devil worship and human sacrifice during uncounted centuries are not to be civilized by the use of the spelling-book alone.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REPUBLICAN DISCONTENT.

It requires no very close observation to convince any one that the Republican party as a whole is in a "state of mind" regarding President Harrison. Audible rumblings of dissatisfaction have been discernible in nearly all parts of the country for several months, and it is noticeable that they have been increasing in volume and distinctness since the November elections. For a time this general party unhappiness found its chief vent in accounts of personal experiences with the President at the White House concerning the distribution of offices, which were related for private information only. When these accounts get into print, as they are certain to do, sooner or later, they will furnish the country with some of the most edifying reading that it has had for many a day. The narrators will not be unsympathetic Mugwumps or malignant Democrats, but tried and true Republicans, and there will be little possibility of disputing the accuracy of their reports. Their time to speak will come when, with the rest of their party, they find themselves no longer too full for utterance, but too full for further silence.

We judge by the unusual step which has been taken by a loyal Republican newspaper of Pittsburgh, the *Chronicle-Telegraph*, that this time is near at hand. That journal has published a broadside in large type of Republican opinions, gathered from all parts of the country, expressing dissatisfaction with the President, asserting that he has not made good use of his opportunities, and declaring that there is a widespread discontent in the party with him because of his course. The opinions are gathered from seventeen States, and in every case the root of all evil is the same—trouble over the distribution of patronage. In New York it is shown that Warner Miller's tragic and neglected position outside the breastworks, combined with the daily spectacle of "Tom" Platt feasting on the inside, has filled the party with dissensions, and sent unhappiness and gloom into thousands of Republican breasts. In Pennsylvania it is shown that both Senators Cameron and Quay are dissatisfied because they have so little influence in the distribution of patronage and the pious Wanamaker has so much. In Missouri the party is "disgruntled" because the advice of the Republican Congressmen has been ignored in the patronage distribution, and Secretary Noble has had full control. In Indiana the trouble is especially personal and aggravated, because the President has insisted upon passing out the patronage for the State with his own hand, completely ignoring the campaign Chairman of the Republican State Committee, Mr. Huston, who, in addition to being rewarded with the office of United States Treasurer, expected to be appointed distributor of patronage for Indiana. "The climax came about six weeks ago, when Mr. Huston's recommendation in the matter of a fourth-class post-office in a Democratic district was disregarded. Mr. Huston is inclined to be extremely disgusted, as he claims that his work during the campaign entitles him to the distribution of this patronage during the term of President Harrison. What angers him more than anything else is the constant recognition of Attorney-General Miller, who contributed $1,000 to the campaign fund, while Mr. Huston stood responsible at one time for $30,000."

From other States the reports are similar in character. Kansas has been "in a ferment almost constantly since the day of inauguration," and the assurance is given that the "trouble over the appointment of a Massachusetts man to be Superintendent of the Haskell Indian School is still fresh in the minds of the public." In Illinois one of the "warmest fights yet made over the distribution of patronage is now being waged over the appointment of five local Federal officers in Chicago. Not only Senator Farwell and Senator Cullom, but all the members of Congress from that part of the State, are in arms against the President. It is argued that this cannot fail to do the party harm." In Michigan both Senators are "amazed and disgusted" because Senatorial requests have small influence at the White House, and "persistent effort alone is rewarded with political patronage." Senator McMillan is "out" with the Administration, and no longer visits the White House, being "disgusted with the political system that makes it necessary for a Senator of the United States to lay aside his dignity, take off his coat and vest, and rush into a fight for small patronage." The Colorado Senators are in "an ugly mood, and it will not take much to cause an open outbreak." The Nebraska Senators have not recovered from their displeasure over the appointment of Patrick Egan as Minister to Chili, against which they protested, but which they were prevailed upon to endorse "by request." Virginia is in complete demoralization over the disastrous defeat which followed the handing over to Mahone by the President of all its patronage. Ohio is not so vociferous in its complaints as other States, but its Republicans have grievances, the chief of which is that they have not received their proper share.

This is a sad condition of affairs, and in many respects an unprecedented one. We do not recall any President before Gen. Harrison who has been subjected to a journalistic attack of this kind within less than a year after his accession to office. That it should be made with so much encouragement and support from Republicans in so many States reveals a most remarkable condition of party feeling. Something unusual ought to be done under the circumstances, and we suggest the calling of a National Mass Republican Convention, "to give expression to party feeling upon the subject of President Harrison, and to transact such other business as may come before it." That would furnish opportunity for a free exchange of views, and would enable the party to formulate some system of office distribution which could be depended upon to make the entire party happy. Such a system is the crying need of the time. If the President had had it, all the present trouble would have been avoided. There must be some final and decisive test for all cases. Whether it shall be the amount of campaign contributions, or political usefulness, or general piety, or relationship to the President's family, or what not, it should be fixed and adhered to. It will be noticed in the opinions collected from Indiana, and cited by us above, that much of the discontent there has been caused because a man who contributed a beggarly $1,000 to the campaign fund has had more voice in the division of patronage than the man who at one time "stood responsible for $30,000" of campaign funds. A fixed scale of influence or appointment—so much influence and such a grade of office for every dollar of contribution—would put an end to this kind of trouble. General piety and family relationship could be rated in a similar way, and on such a fixed system as that a party with a patronage President would have some chance for happiness as well as for a career of glorious statesmanship.

"THE SCIENCE OF RETAIL TRADE."

The United States Statutes provide (sec. 243) that "No person appointed to the office of Secretary of the Treasury, or First Comptroller, or First Auditor, or Treasurer, or Register, shall be directly or indirectly concerned or interested in carrying on the business of trade or commerce," etc., etc., and make violation of this prohibition punishable by a fine of $3,000 and perpetual disqualification for office under the United States Government. This is the statute for the repeal of which President Grant asked, to the amazement of the country, in order that he might give the Secretaryship of the Treasury to Alexander T. Stewart, the great retail dry-goods man—our John Wanamaker of those days. It would have been an advertisement for the store such as no dry-goods man has ever received; but Congress dismissed the President's request with a somewhat disgusted smile.

The reason of the law is obvious. A person engaged in trade or commerce is of necessity either an importer of foreign goods or a competitor of importers in the home markets. It would be easy for him, therefore, if Secretary of the Treasury and in control of all the custom-houses in the country, to use his power to give himself advantages in his own business over his rivals and to the detriment of the Government, either in time, or cost, or information. Congress accordingly, and most properly, determined, as soon as the Government was organized in 1789, to remove all secretaries and leading officers of the Treasury from any such temptation. They might have assumed, considering what the standards of official propriety were at that time, that nobody to whom a Cabinet office was likely to be offered would be guilty of such an impropriety as using his official influence or authority to push his private business. But they did not trust to any such assumption. They said that no man, no matter who he was, no matter what his standing in the church or in the world, should be appointed to a high place in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Treasury while engaged in trade or commerce.

It now appears to be pretty plain that the Congress of 1789 did not go far enough. They ought to have enacted that no head of a department should be engaged in trade or commerce. It is true that we have gone one hundred years without any scandalous results of their failure to do so, but one hundred years is a short time in the history of a great nation, and the longer a scandal of this sort is deferred the greater it is apt to be when it comes. It has come to us now in large proportions through the appointment to a Cabinet place of Mr. John Wanamaker, the great retail storekeeper and advertiser of Philadelphia. His appointment to any Cabinet place would have been a terrible mistake, even if he had had no connection with dry goods, for reasons we gave at the time. His pecuniary services in the canvass were of such a nature that if Gen. Harrison had had any fineness of political, to say nothing of moral, perception, he would have seen that they were a disqualification for high office. He ought to have shrunk with horror from the very suspicion that any one had bought a Cabinet appointment from him. Even his friends, therefore, were amazed when Wanamaker was made Postmaster-General, for the control of the post-office by the greatest advertiser in the country, a man whose "drummers" swarmed in every village, and who sold everything from pins and needles to India shawls by dint of puffery, was a scandal in itself, a *scandalum in se*, even if not a *scandalum prohibitum*. It was plainly possible for Mr. Wanamaker to make every country postmaster an agent for the sale of his wares, and it was no answer to this to say that a man who maintained a Sunday-school and prayed publicly would not do such a thing. The Congress of 1789 trusted to no such preventives. They did not say a trader or merchant might be Secretary of the Treasury if he was a praying man or Sunday-school teacher. They said, "No person"—no such person, no matter what guarantees of character or piety he may offer—shall hold this place.

Mr. Wanamaker has now been only eight months in office, and he is already using his official position *openly* to advertise his business. His place in the Cabinet of course put a certain compulsion on the Pan-American delegates, who are all well-bred gentlemen, to visit his store the other day, and enabled him to make the visit a great public function. It has, too, undoubtedly given him the brass necessary for imposing on each delegate and his wife a "souvenir," in the shape of a box containing two books which are thus described in a Washington despatch to the *Sun:*

"The largest, which is the exact size of the box, is bound in seal, and fastened together with heavy brown ribbon. On the outer cover is stamped in gilt the fanciful trade-mark of Mr. Wanamaker's store, and in the lower right-hand corner of the cover, also in letters of gilt, are the words: 'Compliments of John Wanamaker, Philadelphia, U. S. A., November 11, 1889.' The covers are lined with light brown silk, and the fly leaf is composed of a sheet of heavy white satin, to which is tied a card bearing the colors of the South American States held in the talons of a gilt eagle, which also clutches an American shield. The body of the book consists of a fourteen-page engraved address, setting forth the wonders of the great retail establishment, followed by three pages, each of which gives a diagram in minute detail of each of the first three floors of the store, showing exactly the use to which each compartment is put. A remarkable thing in connection with this illuminated address, which contains many remarkable things, is the dedication. Each souvenir is dedicated especially to the delegate to whom it is addressed, and opens with the following neat suggestion of how to connect the business of the Pan-American Congress with John Wanamaker's store:

"'DEAR SIR: Confident of our commanding position in the mercantile world as leaders in the retail commerce, and believing that we have reached the highest point yet attained in our country in the science of retail trading, we beg leave to ask your acceptance of this souvenir of your visit to our place of business, in the hope that it contains information of sufficient interest to warrant its submission to your Government as a portion of your report upon the honorable Congress to which you are accredited.'"

Of course if Wanamaker were not a member of the Cabinet, the delegates would treat this impudent little epistle with silent contempt, and dispose of the whole advertisement as such things are usually disposed of at this season of the year. We cannot recall a case in which any Government has been subjected to the particular kind of humiliation which Wanamaker has here inflicted on ours. It ought to be plain to President Harrison that he is just as ripe for prompt dismissal as Tanner was. He has not proved a particularly good Postmaster-General, as many people who were disgusted by his electioneering thought he might. The occupation of his life—enticing people to his store in search of bargains—doubtless makes the silent, unobtrusive, and faithful discharge of a public duty distasteful if not impossible to him.

THE "FARMERS' CONGRESS" AT MONTGOMERY.

THE Montgomery *Advertiser* brings us the text of the resolutions adopted by the so-called "National Farmers' Congress," recently held at that place, together with some account of the Congress—its genesis and its controlling purpose. The capital of Alabama is not exactly the place where we should look to see a representative body of American farmers assembled. It is rather out of the way for the great body of agriculturists, and we all know that farmers are averse to long journeys and large travelling expenses. The fact that the chief topic of debate was the tariff on wool, and that the person who made the most stir was the Hon. William Lawrence of the Ohio Wool-Growers' Association, suggested some doubts as to the representative character of the body.

The Montgomery *Advertiser* resolves these doubts in a satisfactory way. It says that this National Farmers' Congress consisted of delegates appointed by Governors of States—not all the States, but rather more than half of the number. The *Advertiser* thinks that the farmers of the country are quite capable of choosing their own representatives to such congresses, when they have the opportunity or the inclination, and that a Congress composed of members appointed by Governors will be more likely to represent the Governors than to represent the farmers. It thinks also that this was the actual state of the case at Montgomery.

The resolutions which engaged the largest share of attention related, as we have said, to the duty on wool, and here we have to note a decided alteration in the tone of the high-tariff party as represented by the Hon. William Lawrence of Ohio. The report submitted by this gentleman is not a declaration in favor of protection in the abstract. It does not even affirm that protection is a good thing for the country as a whole or for the farmers in particular, but merely that as long as Congress maintains that policy agriculture should be as fully protected as manufactures. Starting from this postulate, the resolutions read as follows:

"Resolved, That while as now a protective tariff is maintained which substantially prohibits the importation of foreign carpets and many other articles of manufactured goods, we demand that the duties on mutton sheep and wool of all kinds shall be so increased as to equally prohibit the importation of mutton sheep and of wool of every kind which can, under protection, be sufficiently produced at fairly remunerative prices in the United States, to supply all American wants, including the better class of carpet wools, especially as carpets are luxuries, entitled to less favor than farm and ranch products.

"Resolved, That the tariff on wool imported to make carpets should at least be as high as that imported to make coats. The same policy which will secure cheap cloths will secure cheap carpets.

"Resolved, That if protection to this extent be denied, we call upon the farmers of the United States to assert their power at the ballot-box and otherwise to right the wrong and injustice of discrimination against them. If they fail in this, the wool and mutton-producing industries will be so seriously crippled that they will be, in a large measure, destroyed, and farmers will no longer have any interest in protection for the manufacture of woollen goods, but will insist that it shall have no larger measure of protection than is accorded to the wool industry, including every kind of wool."

The report was adopted, not without considerable opposition, the vote being 170 ayes to 89 noes. All the Southern States voted no except Florida and Kentucky, whose votes were divided, there being twenty-one States and one Territory voting.

It is easy to see that the prime object of the alleged Congress was to manufacture public opinion regarding the tariff tax on carpet wool rather than on wool in general. This circumstance reminds us that the Senate bill of last year nearly doubled the tax on carpet wool, raising the duties from 2½ to 4 cents per pound on the coarser grades, to the great surprise of the public, even those of protectionist leanings, since these coarse carpet wools are not produced in this country, and cannot be under present conditions or under any conditions likely to prevail here. Probably the carpet-manufacturers were not so much surprised as other people, because they have been well informed all the time of the movements of the Wool-Growers' Association. The alleged Wool-Manufacturers' Association, whose pretensions to represent the woollen industry are almost as transparent as those of the Wool-Growers' Association to represent farming, but who do represent that portion of the woollen interest which is in subjection to the wool-growers, adopted a resolution at their last meeting deprecating any increase

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the duties on carpet wool. The resolution was in these words:

"Resolved, That the increase of the duties upon wools used exclusively in the manufacture of carpets, amounting to 60 per cent., proposed in the Senate bill, cannot stimulate the American growth of the coarse, low-grade wools now cultivated only in semi-barbarous countries, and commanding less prices than the better wools grown to better advantage by our farmers, and at no additional cost, everywhere in the United States. On the other hand, such duties must seriously cripple the one branch of the woollen manufacture which has been enabled to fully supply all the demands of the home market at greatly reduced prices to the consumer."

Undoubtedly we may look for the tug-of-war on this subject when the committees of the new House of Representatives are appointed.

SHIP CANALS.

In the world of trade it may be said that fashions prevail, as well as in other spheres where whim and caprice hold more legitimate empire. Means of expediting commerce by shortening routes, and by the introduction of mechanical devices for attaining greater speed on land and sea, are undoubtedly the offspring of a necessity arising from the urgent demands of these busy times, and still it is equally true that the example of one prominent achievement of recent years, the Suez Canal, has set many minds thinking upon problems of inland navigation in other quarters. The conception of a canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans at Panama is three centuries old, to be sure, but it lingered as a dream until the success of Suez encouraged an attempt at its execution in fact. The failure at Panama has in no wise dampened the enthusiasm for ship canals. It is said that this ill-fated enterprise may not yet in reality be dead, and we are fain to believe that ships will soon be sailing from sea to sea at Nicaragua. Aside from these, a whole brood of other canals, great and small, have either been commenced or suggested. In brief, there are three in progress in foreign countries, and eighteen projected, while four are being carried toward completion in America, and the plans of twelve more are on paper, which, with the twelve existing foreign canals and the four at home, make a total of fifty-three. R. E. Peary, in a recent issue of the "Transactions of the American Society of Civil Engineers," presents a most interesting collection of statistical data respecting these enterprises, some of which will be new and surprising to those who have not been able to watch such matters closely.

If all the British projects now mooted are successfully executed, England, Scotland, and Ireland will be divided into a number of smaller islands. An Irish canal between Galway and Dublin would shorten by many hours the journey from New York to ports on the Irish Sea. The Newcastle-on-Tyne Canal, from the Tyne to Solway Firth, would open, in connection with the former, the shortest possible route from New York and Boston to the ports of Belgium, Holland, and Germany. The same advantages, with others of great local value, are claimed for the Scotch Canal from the Clyde to the Forth, which it is proposed to enlarge from its present depth of nine feet to a size suitable for the passage of the largest ships. A large force of men is engaged in constructing the canal from Manchester to the Mersey, which will be completed in 1891. This is one of the most important projects of its kind in the world, not alone because it seems destined to divert an immense portion of the trade of Liverpool, but because, if it proves as successful as its promoters anticipate, other inland cities will follow the example of Manchester, thus altering the currents of English internal traffic as they exist to-day.

In Europe projects are equally numerous. Brussels, Bruges, and Paris are zealous for communication with the sea. An Italian canal from the Adriatic to the Mediterranean is suggested, and it is claimed that a route can be opened at a cost of $37,000,000 through Moravia and the two Silesias, connecting the Oder and Danube, which could pass large vessels from the Baltic to the Black Sea. Navigation could then be extended from the Black Sea to the Caspian by a canal fifty-three miles in length from the Don to the Volga. These, and more besides, are in serious contemplation; but of more importance than any of the foregoing is the Holstein or North Sea-Baltic, which is being rapidly built, and which when completed will serve a shipping having a registered tonnage of 9,000,000 tons, almost double that now using the Suez Canal, in addition to offering military advantages of inestimable value to the German Empire. Not only will it effect an enormous saving in distance and time for vessels bound to and from the Baltic, but it will avert the annual disasters which result in a loss of some 200 sailing craft attempting the dangerous passage around the north of Denmark.

Suggestions have also been made for shortening the route to Mediterranean ports and to the East. One of these is to deepen the old Languedoc Canal from Bordeaux to Narbonne, while another project contemplates a new canal having nearly the same terminal points. By sailing thus direct from the Bay of Biscay into the Mediterranean a voyage of 700 miles around the Peninsula of Spain would be avoided. Then from the Mediterranean other shorter routes than Suez are indicated for reaching the Indian Ocean. A cut from Acre to the Jordan Valley and thence to the Red Sea has its advocates; and another from Antioch to the Euphrates, and thence to the Tigris, would open a direct passage to the Gulf of Arabia. But the engineering difficulties in these last two projects are so great that they may safely be considered as purely visionary.

It may not be known that M. de Lesseps has figured in other schemes than Suez and Panama. In 1881 a company was organized, with M. de Lesseps as honorary president, to build the long-talked of canal across the Isthmus of Corinth. This enterprise, whose necessity was foreseen by Periander, Cæsar, Caligula, and others, and which was at one time undertaken by Nero, will serve a commerce which estimates have placed at 4,500,000 tons. M. de Lesseps, in the interest of a French company, has also obtained a concession from the King of Siam to construct a canal across the Isthmus of Malacca, which would save a voyage of 500 miles between Europe and Chinese ports through the treacherous straits of the Malay Archipelago.

Coming to our own shores, it may be well to point out the enormous advantage which the St. Mary's Canal has been to our internal commerce. A small traffic in 1855 has risen to the extraordinary figure of 6,932,000 tons which passed through it in the year ending July, 1889. Its original dimensions, which had been increased in 1881, proved totally inadequate to accommodate the growing trade, so that a further deepening to twenty feet and an enlargement of the locks—now the largest in the world—has been undertaken, and when this is finished it is probable that St. Mary's will serve a larger traffic than any canal in the world until the facilities offered at Nicaragua have created new and more extensive commercial dealings with the countries of the South.

There is a series of canals which in time is certain to be constructed between the great cities of our Atlantic seaboard, and the present awakening of interest in such projects bids fair to hasten its consummation. This line of inland water-way would consist of the Cape Cod Canal, from Buzzard's Bay to Barnstable Bay, which would save from 70 to 140 miles from Boston to various southern ports; the Delaware-New York Bay Canal; and the Delaware-Chesapeake Canal. By such a system as this, not only would commerce have a direct and cheap route from Boston and New York to Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk, and the ports in the Carolina sounds, but it would enable us to concentrate war-vessels with extreme rapidity at any of these important places, and would preclude the interception of communication by blockading fleets in the event of war. When the Nicaragua Canal has given an impetus to southern trade, the need of the canal for which a charter was granted in 1883, from the St. John's River, Florida, to the Suwanee, on the Gulf Coast, will become so imperative that it cannot long be delayed. Then the chain will be complete, and our merchants will enjoy advantages, in reaching speedily and cheaply the ports of Spanish America, which will throw the balance largely in their favor against competition from Europe. With such encouragements as these, it would seem that an American shipping ought to spring up which would give us that supremacy on the sea which it should be the effort of our law-makers to facilitate by every legitimate means within their power.

THE HEREDITARY PRINCIPLE.

The dismissal of the Emperor of Brazil—for dismissal seems to be the word—will not strengthen something which now needs a great deal of strengthening—the hereditary principle in government. It is weak in England and Italy, and certainly not strong in Austria, and is extinct in France. The Imperialists made a curious attempt to revive it in the last-named country by basing it on a plébiscite—that is, asking the people to elect a particular saviour of society, with the privi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lege of transmitting his place to his son, who might not have any capacity whatever for saving society. In England the House of Lords has brought the principle into great discredit through the misconduct of some peers and the abdication of their legislative functions by others, and perhaps more than all by the gross mental and moral inferiority of the sons of some men raised to the peerage for distinguished service in the army or at the bar. It is these contrasts which most glaringly reduce the rule to absurdity.

In Germany it has been a good deal strengthened of late by the high character and great services both of the old Emperor and his son Frederick, and will probably not suffer by the career of the present occupant of the throne if he commits no striking indiscretion, such as plunging the country into a needless or unfortunate war. He works hard at his duties, as nearly all the sovereigns of his house have done, and the idea that the king is the servant as well as the ruler of the State, and must be a man fit for active service in the field, fortifies the royal authority. In England the incapacity of the sovereign ever since the accession of the house of Hanover, nearly two centuries ago, for all serious work, either of war or statesmanship, would probably before now have had a disastrous effect on the monarchy but for the timely appearance of the present Queen. She rendered it the inestimable service of presenting the nation with the spectacle of a pure and conscientious domestic and official life just as the rule of the old aristocracy was overthrown and the serious and puritanical middle class was coming into power by the passage of the first Reform Bill. What has been the effect on the hereditary régime of the career of her children and grandchildren cannot be known as long as she lives, but the general impression is that it will be found at her death that the throne no longer rests,

> —— "unshaken still,
> Broad based upon a people's will";

that there will come a period of sufferance instead of one of loyal and hearty support. The light that beats on the throne is now so fierce, owing to the newspapers and the spread of the suffrage, that no prince who is not moral and hard-working can be sure of his place. The old mediæval monarch, in fact, surrounded by semi-divine honors, and incapable of doing wrong, cannot exist without the mediæval feeling of "loyalty," and this has perished or is perishing in every modern State. The English Revolution of 1640 gave it its first shock. The French Revolution still further weakened it, and the continued success of the American Republic and the accompanying growth of that curious social and political solvent, "American humor," has almost extirpated it. It would be difficult to find in Europe to-day, outside the inner court circle, any one who would confess that he felt it in its purity, or confess that he felt it at all without a deprecating smile. And then the dethronement of so many minor Italian and German princes since 1866, and, above all, the dethronement of the Pope and the downfall of Louis Napoleon, have done a great deal to cheapen royalty as an institution.

The dismissal of the Emperor of Brazil without trouble or violence, and with a handsome pecuniary solatium, must give all heirs to thrones all over the world a considerable shock, but no intelligent person will draw from anything that has happened in Brazil, or is happening anywhere, the conclusion that the hereditary principle has never had any value. On the contrary, it has rendered the modern world incalculable service in securing the peaceful devolution of great powers and enormous masses of property in the days when law was feeble, and every man who had a claim of any kind was ready to assert it with his sword. In fact, it is difficult to see how modern Europe could ever have emerged from the dark ages if the idea that the king's eldest son had a moral right to the crown, and the lord's eldest son had a moral right to the estates, had not taken fast hold of men's minds. It prevented prodigious waste of life and property, and gave continuity to the government and to society in times when security seemed of all earthly blessings the hardest to attain. Hereditary monarchy filled a most useful place until the habit of government by discussion and of submission to a majority vote had obtained a firm place in political manners, and a change in the supreme executive had become a possible and safe legal process. As this habit grows in monarchical countries, there is little doubt the desire to get rid of the expense and display of monarchical institutions will bear fruit everywhere.

It is certainly very odd that the popular faith in "blood" should, for political and social purposes, be as strong as it is, in view of the extreme rarity with which parents transmit either great mental or moral qualities to their offspring. Able sons of able fathers are by no means unknown phenomena, but they are too scarce to warrant the respect with which all children of remarkable parents are still treated. The explanation of the anomaly probably is, that the popular mind is still so much affected by the transmission of physical qualities that it infers from it the transmission of the nobler ones also. The hereditary transmission of physical qualities is as common among men as among the animals. The large men and the strong men are apt to have large and strong sons, and *may* have sons with as much brains, or tenacity, or industry, or integrity; but the popular presumption is apt to convert the "may" into "must."

THE UNIVERSITIES AND THE PROFESSIONS.

THERE is more or less perturbation in the collegiate world over the decline in the number of students, in proportion to population, who now seek a university education. In Germany the supply is kept up by the fact that a university degree is necessary for a great many offices in the gift of the Government, and for the retention of a certain social position, and there the complaint is that the university men are a drug in the labor market, and that large numbers of them pass their lives on the verge of starvation. But in England and in this country, although the number of colleges and of students grows rapidly, it does not grow in anything like the same ratio as the population. This fact began to be noticeable half-a-century ago in the United States; it has been extremely noticeable during the last twenty years in England.

There are, of course, various reasons assigned for it, of which the most prominent is the great delay imposed by a university education on a young man's entrance on life. The competition in all callings is very fierce. The question which fathers and mothers are everywhere asking themselves with most earnestness is, "What shall we do with our boys" to enable them to earn a living? The answer which comes back from nearly every trade and occupation is, that any boy who wishes to succeed must begin early, and that the youth who starts on the work of his life at seventeen or eighteen is sure to have very great advantages over the youth who begins at twenty-three or twenty-four, even if the latter have obtained a college degree. A college graduate who wishes to enter one of the professions through the best channels—whether law, or medicine, or the ministry, engineering or architecture—as a rule is graduated at twenty-two and needs three years more to get his purely professional training, so that he can hardly take the field in good earnest before he is twenty-five or twenty-six. But by that time his friend who has refused to go to college is four or five years ahead of him, and has, unless a dunce or a drone, obtained a good footing on the lower steps of the ladder. This difference, of which the public becomes more sensible every year, of course keeps a great many young men, promising as well as unpromising, on whom the necessity for earning a living bears hard, from taking a college degree. They seek only that kind of training which will most speedily fit them to earn money. They appreciate the academic course, acknowledge its many advantages, and wish they had had it: but they set it down as a luxury, and can point to scores of eminent and successful men in every calling who have dispensed with it. In fact, there are a good many branches of business, both in England and here, in which a college graduate is not welcome at all, not only because he comes late, when he is no longer pliable, but because his degree has given him some self-importance, and possibly, in England, some of the contempt for "trade" which is common in the public schools as well as at the universities.

Most of the colleges have been debating a good deal of late the best mode of meeting this imperious and increasing demand for an early entrance on active life. President Adams of Cornell has taken up the subject in his recent report, but exaggerates in saying that the German graduate gets to work at twenty-two, the American only at twenty-six. The difference is about half as great as this. Moreover, he is not the first college president to raise the question. It has been under discussion at Harvard since 1883, and has considerable space given to it in President Eliot's report for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1883-'84. The Medical Faculty at Harvard took it up and presented a memorial to the Academic Council on it in 1886, and President Eliot's report for 1886-'87 said that the evil "affected American colleges quite as unfavorably as it did the professional schools." In consequence of all this, the Harvard Academic Council voted on November 15, 1887, "that with a view to lower the average age at which Bachelors of Arts can enter the professional schools and the Graduate Department, the College Faculty be requested to consider the expediency of a reduction of the college course."

The question is undoubtedly a very serious one, and one that increases in gravity every year. There are two ways of meeting it. One is the shortening of the academic course by a year or more. The other is the injection of technical or professional studies into the Senior year. All the leading colleges are trying to choose. There is one other device which might be a help if not a solution, and that is letting every man take his degree whenever he could pass the needed examination. This would enable the studious, hard-working student to shorten his course almost to any extent his capacity or industry permitted. It might also do something towards hastening that most desirable consummation, the reservation of all the great colleges to the really studious men who are eager to learn, and who value the place for its scholastic rather than its social advantages. There is at present a prodigious waste of collegiate money and time on young men who are not eager to enter on life's work, and in fact do not care how long their exit from college is postponed. No college owes this class anything whatever, and it is a question whether their appearance in the world as graduates does not do much to discredit university education in the eyes of the multitude. The motto "Disce aut decede," or, freely translated, "Study or clear out," ought to be engraved on every college gateway.

THE MORAL ASPECT OF THE FRENCH EXPOSITION.

THE *Revue des Deux Mondes* has been publishing a very interesting series of articles on the Paris Exposition by the Vicomte de Vogüé, the well-known member of the French Academy. The closing one of the series appears in the latest number of the review, in the shape of an attempt to point out the moral and intellectual significance of the Exposition as a commemoration of the Revolution of 1789. He asks the question at the outset whether the France which has organized this commemoration is really faithful to what are called "the principles of 1789"—that is, approaches social and political questions in the same spirit as the France which made the Revolution. He answers it by an emphatic negative. He says the spirit of the Revolution, meaning thereby the worship of equality, of "the rights of man," and the faith that these two doctrines would in some manner transform the world and produce general happiness, is dead. Liberty, Equality, Fraternity—the watchword of the Revolution—has been relegated to the garret. What has taken its place? Fatalism, Selection by heredity, and the right of Might. Science, or Realism, has slain all the old idols, and pulled down the geometrical temple created for their worship by the Revolution.

The transformation has taken place in literature and art as well as in politics. The realists, or naturalists, are all the rage in literature. In politics the civil engineers enjoy the popular admiration which used to be bestowed on the orators and lawyers. Europe has been transformed by Bismarck, because Bismarck represented the new social force, Louis Napoleon the old one. It was a state of mind, no less than a political régime, which was overthrown at Sedan. Gambetta endeavored to adapt himself to the new methods, but his education was too classic to enable him to succeed. He made his famous speech at Romans on the new France that he foresaw, a few days after the German Chancellor made his equally famous one in the Reichstag on Socialism. "Between the language of the German statesman and that of the French orator, there were the same differences," says M. de Vogüé, "as between a book or a picture of the realistic school and a work of art of forty years ago, between a bit of Schopenhauer and an oratorical exposition of M. Cousin."

The change in France, he says, has been long in preparation. The new ideas have been for years working to the surface, just as the philosophic ideas of the Revolution had been for years working to the surface before the Revolution came. But just as the old régime received its death-blow the day on which that terrible satire the "Mariage de Figaro" was produced on the stage in Paris, so also the régime set up by the Revolution received its death-blow, M. de Vogüé thinks, on the day on which Darwin first found French readers. He adds:

"On the eve of the meeting of the States-General a superficial observer might have deceived himself as to the approaching dislocation of French society. The old régime still existed apparently intact. Royalty commanded in the name of the old law, and was obeyed by its organs. The people adored their sovereign; contemporary testimony is positive on this point. Nevertheless, the majesty of etiquette did not conceal the void. Among all thinking men, among the leaders of society, the new philosophy had killed the roots of the old tree. The old formal homage was rendered to the King at Versailles. . . . But every one had a presentiment of a revolution which would put into social practice the ideas which had mastered people's understanding. It is the same to-day. The principles which then triumphed are in possession of the State. They are inscribed on all our walls. They control the drafting of our laws; they are celebrated in our public fêtes; they protect our interests; but their virtue is exhausted; their decline is discussed publicly by writers, secretly by politicians. Other principles, the product of the new philosophy, have replaced them in the controlling minds of the community. Every one is asking what will be the result of the expected evolution. Some think it near, others remote; but there is no doubt that the force which shapes the destinies of men and nations will do its work once more in France by bringing the institutions of the country into harmony with the reigning ideas."

All this is very interesting as the conclusions of a very penetrating philosophic observer, but it is really, even if all true, much less serious than it seems. What it foreshadows is really, in plain English, the return of France to the paths of experience, which she forsook at the Revolution, for what John Stuart Mill has somewhere called the "high priori road," on which she has during the past century had so many laughable as well as terrible adventures. If all that M. de Vogüé foresees should come to pass, it would simply mean the conduct of the French Government on those great principles of human nature which have presided over the growth of the American Union and the British Empire since 1789.

HIGHER EDUCATION FOR WOMEN IN GERMANY.—I.

AMONG the progressive nations of the western world, Germany has hitherto clung most tenaciously to what we will venture to call the sweet-and-simple theory of the destiny of women. In other lands the claim of women to a more independent position, at least in the matter of educational privileges, has been very generally recognized in practical ways, so that to-day women of intellectual ambition either have access to the existing universities, or else are provided for in schools of their own established for the express purpose of furnishing them the same sort of mental pabulum that is given to their brothers. The state of affairs in our own country, which may without vanity be called a leader in this respect, does not need to be described. In England, as is well known, the cause of higher education for women has lately been making advances that amount to little short of a revolution. France, which had previously conferred academic degrees somewhat freely upon women, set out, in 1880, upon the policy of building *lycées* for them, and dates a new era in its educational history from the passage of the Camille Say law. The Spanish universities are now open to women, and these are availing themselves, in small numbers, of the opportunity offered, especially for the study of medicine. At the recent educational conference in Paris the most eloquent advocate of first-rate educational facilities for women was a Spaniard. Italy opened its universities to women in 1876.

It may be said in general that in the "Latin" nations the cause of the women has been championed from the outset by men, while among the Germanic nations the women have taken up the matter themselves and been largely instrumental in winning over the men to their views. Sweden admitted women to its universities in 1870, and three years later opened its academic degrees to them, except in law and theology. The latest Upsala catalogue, which lies before us, shows a goodly sprinkling of feminine names. Denmark followed in 1875; women can now take degrees at Copenhagen in everything but theology. In 1880 Holland, Belgium, and Norway joined the procession. The Swiss universities have long admitted women, Zürich having led the way in 1868.

In marked contrast to all this stand Germany and Austria, where the influence of authority, both civil and academic, has seemed to set more and more against the innovation. Not that women are excluded from German lecture-rooms: they are sometimes, especially if from abroad, allowed to "hear," but the privilege does not carry with it the right to matriculate or to be examined for a degree. Of late even the blessed boon of "hearing" seems to be more and more grudgingly bestowed; the mass of German professors take no pains to conceal the fact that they do not want the women

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about. Nor, speaking broadly, are there any separate schools for women which can compensate for their exclusion from the universities. Aside from the feeble beginnings to be mentioned below, it may be said that Germany has not taken the first step towards providing for the higher instruction of its daughters in any such spirit as it has long provided for that of its sons. Thus we have the curious state of affairs that the country whose universities have been for half a century the admiration and resort of the world, is now sending its ambitious and talented young women abroad (as yet in small numbers, to be sure), because the gates of knowledge are barred against them at home.

The attitude of the Germans, especially professors and bureaucrats, with regard to woman's sphere is well known. It comes to view in all its impressiveness in a last year's address of Geheimer Oberregierungsrath Dr. K. Schneider of Berlin. "Where now," sternly asks Dr. Schneider, "does woman best fulfil her appointed destiny? Again Holy Writ gives us the answer: 'And they said unto him, Where is Sarah thy wife? And he said, Behold, in the tent.'" It is this sort of patriarchal philosophy which is master of the situation in Germany. Colored more or less by modern poetry, masking oftentimes under chivalrous and deferential language, but thoroughly contemptuous of woman's claim to anything like an intellectual equality with man, it controls the class that governs and the class that teaches. And as for the women themselves, the great majority placidly accept the rôle assigned them, enjoy the homage they receive in print for being "good," and go on believing that what their profound men-folk say must of course be true. Under these circumstances it would seem as if the outlook for any agitation of the woman question in Germany must be somewhat dreary. Nevertheless, such an agitation is going on briskly. A small but clear-headed band of reformers, chiefly women, have long been working to bring about a change of affairs, and there are signs that they are gaining ground. Prominent among them is Helene Lange, author of an interesting pamphlet, "Frauenbildung," and other brochures. To Fräulein Lange's various writings the author of this article is largely indebted.

The reform movement began several years ago, in an attempt to secure for women a larger and more influential representation upon the teaching-force of the public high schools for girls. These schools have grown up in Germany as a sort of pendant to the gymnasia. They receive girls at about the age of seven and graduate them in eight or nine years. In the first year the pupils are given eighteen lessons a week, which number is gradually increased to thirty or thirty-two lessons in the last years of the course. The subject made most of is German, which, including "reading," occupies about 22 per cent. of the pupil's total time. Next to this in importance come French and arithmetic, taking together as much time as German. After these come religion, needlework, calisthenics, occupying another 22 per cent.; then drawing, English, singing, geography, history, together about 23 per cent. The remainder of the time goes to Italian, natural history, physics, chemistry, and writing. (These figures are computed from the Prussian "Normal Lehrplan.")

The organization of the schools is similar to that of the gymnasia, and the charge so often brought of late against the latter, that their pupils are stuffed rather than educated, applies with still greater force to the girls' schools. The large number of daily lessons, the great variety of subjects nibbled at in the course of a week, the extreme youthfulness of the girls at graduation, make it impossible that their school training should, in average cases, do much either in developing the mind or in deepening and ennobling the character. It is to such a furious cramming process as this that the brightest and most fortunate German girls are everywhere subjected; and from this they pass directly to—wedlock, or whatever other fate awaits them. They have no opportunity, as their brothers have, to correct their superficiality by a period of leisurely, independent, concentrated study at a university; hence it is, as a rule, not corrected at all. The great majority of the graduates simply forget what they have "learned," and that is the end of it. At nineteen their education is mainly a reminiscence, a feeling of "gehabt haben."

Such being the state of affairs, we can hardly wonder that the "höhere Mädchenschule" should have become a favorite target for satire, and the cause of much uneasiness; or that a movement has been started looking towards a somewhat radical change of its theory and organization. The theory against which the protest is directed was formulated as far back as 1872 by a convention of girls'-school teachers which had met at Weimar in that year. This body gave utterance to the proposition that the German girl must receive a good education, to the end that the German man may not be bored "at the domestic hearth" by the ignorance of his wife. In other words, the public instruction of girls was to be based in fact, if not in form, upon the Rousseau philosophy, "La femme est faite spécialement pour plaire à l'homme." Of this position it was an obvious corollary that the instruction of girls should be in the hands of men, since men might be supposed to know best what would prevent men from being bored at the domestic hearth. This wisdom naturally excited opposition from the first, but the protesters were so hopelessly in the minority as hardly to be noticed. Of late, however, they have organized for the campaign, as our politicians say, and the results of their work are already beginning to appear.

THE FORGED LETTERS OF WASHINGTON.

WASHINGTON, November 4, 1889.

THE use of forged letters and spurious newspaper extracts in a political campaign has become so barefaced and insolent as to create a feeling of wonder whether the moral sense of the people has become deadened, and public spirit callous to such impositions. During the Revolution an experiment of this kind was made that has passed into history, but in such a form that comparatively little of its interest has been developed and the story never told as it might be. The singularity of the experiment—for in that contest and for many years after I am unable to trace any similar trick—and the impotency in results, make it worthy of a more careful study than has been accorded to it.

In May or June, 1777, John Bew, a well-known bookseller and Ministerial publisher of London, sent out from his presses a pamphlet containing seven letters purporting to have been written by General Washington to his friends in 1776, and to have been captured at the taking of Fort Lee. The account of the capture was very circumstantial and apparently truthful. The body-servant of the General, a mulatto named Billy, had been left behind because of illness, and in a portmanteau in his possession the letters were found. Now, Washington did have a body-servant of that name, purchased in 1768 from Mary Lee for £61 15s., and so great a favorite that he was specially mentioned in Washington's will, where he is given his "immediate freedom" should he desire it, and an annuity of $30 a year, in recognition of "my sense of his attachment to me, and for his faithful services during the Revolutionary war." But none of Washington's immediate servants were taken by the British in the course of the war, his papers were never captured, and in August, 1776, fearing the issue of the campaign round New York, he had sent all his public and private papers to Philadelphia, not calling for them until late in December. How improbable, then, was it that his servant should in November be carrying in his portmanteau letters written in the previous June and July. These facts, however, could not have been known to the British public.

The letters purported to give a "fairer and fuller view of American politics than ever yet transpired," and were they genuine they were well calculated to create surprise, for they represented the General as longing for peace and reconciliation with the mother country; disheartened under the burdens and responsibilities of the war, discontented with the army and with Congress, complaining of the Virginia officers as well as those of New England, and expressing his disgust at some of the political leaders in Virginia. There is a strong local color in these letters, and the cleverness and skill with which they are constructed, copying even the punctuation generally used by the General, might easily have misled the reader. Moreover, the intimate knowledge shown of the General's habits and of his family gave an additional reason for their genuineness, and even in America they might have been accepted at first sight as true. The fabricator shows a lamentable ignorance of dates, and in some parts of his handiwork trips on facts, drawing too heavily on his memory, his imagination, or the newspapers. But surely a public that could swallow almost weekly a total defeat of Washington's army, mutiny in his troops, the capture and even death of the General, might well be excused for tasting of the feast laid before them in these letters.

That they were compiled for a purpose is evident on their face. They would strengthen the war party in England, give aid to the Ministry to push the issue, and uphold the idea that the contest would be speedily terminated by the complete overthrow of the rebellion in the colonies and the reëstablishment of the authority of King and Parliament in those dependencies. From that standpoint it is not strange to have them published by a Ministerial printer, and it would not be surprising to discover that the author was in close relations with the Ministry, even if private pique or revenge may not have contributed to the suggestion of manufacturing them. But the purposes of the writer were not confined to the English public; they reached over the Atlantic, and, could they be widely circulated there, they might discredit Washington with the Continental Army, with Congress, and with the people, and, by creating suspicions of his integrity, and of his honesty in dealing with the two great factions of North and South—even then existing—introduce dissensions into the councils of the "rebels." Surely such an end was worth the "good beefsteak" that Richard Henry Lee thought was due to the forger from his masters.

The letters, though creating no stir in England, where they were in cold blood set down as forgeries, were eagerly seized upon by the Tory printers in America. Rivington of New York, who would make a model leader-writer

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on a party organ of to-day, so little did he care for truth, justice, or the feelings of others, was the first to obtain them, printing one as a broadside to be sent into the American camp, and the others in his *Gazette*, whence they were at once made up into a small pamphlet. His Tory colleagues in Philadelphia, James Robertson—formerly associated with the poet John Trumbull—and James Humphreys, jr., whose loyalist principles had led to his exile from Philadelphia while in Continental hands, also utilized these letters in the columns of their newspapers. The results were by no means commensurate to the end in view, and it is rare to meet with so much as a reference to these letters in contemporaneous correspondence. To Washington, sensitive as he was to that form of criticism, they caused a moment of anxiety, coming as they did immediately after the "Conway Cabal," in which members of Congress and leaders in the army had been involved. But the publication caused only a ripple of excitement, one more of curiosity than of indignation; and so little attention was paid to it that Washington did not think it necessary to make any public denial of their authorship. They failed at this time, but they were ready for the uses of unscrupulous libellers in later years.

Who was the writer of these letters? So far as I know, only one attempt was made to unravel the mystery of the authorship. The *Monthly Review* of London suggested the Rev. Mr. V——, probably the Rev. John Vardill of New York, who had gone to England in 1774 to take holy orders, and had written on the Ministerial side; some poetical satires on the Whigs being attributed to his pen. He is commemorated in 'McFingal':

> "In Vardill, that poetic zealot,
> I view a lawn-bedizened prelate;
> While mitres fall, as 'tis their duty,
> On heads of Chandler and Auchmuty."

It is impossible to conceive, however, that a total stranger to Washington and to Virginia could have compiled these letters, even when the facts might have been given him by others. There are too many personal touches, showing an intimate acquaintance with Washington, to allow of such a supposition. Fortunately, a letter from one of Washington's aids, Tench Tilghman, is in existence, that gives us a clue, based in all likelihood upon a statement of Washington himself, for it was his custom to talk very freely with his family. Tilghman wrote:

"He [the General] suspects Jack Randolph for the author, as the letters contain a knowledge of his family affairs that none but a Virginian could be acquainted with. The sentiments are noble, and such as the General himself often expresses. I have heard him declare a thousand times, and he does it every day in the most public company, that independence was furthest of anything from his thoughts, and that he never entertained the idea until he plainly saw that absolute conquest was the aim, and unconditional submission the terms which Great Britain meant to grant."

Apart from this bit of evidence, and the existence of one of the broadside issues of the letter in the Du Simitière collection, with a note, "wrote by a Mr. Randolph of Virginia," there is internal evidence that "Jack Randolph," the last royal Attorney-General of Virginia, and father of Edmund Randolph, was the fabricator. He approaches accuracy when detailing matters or impressions that occurred prior to November, 1775, when he sailed for England. He is most minute in facts that Washington might have written to Mrs. Washington or to Lund Washington, with both of whom Randolph was in close friendship. "Surely," wrote Lund in the fall of 1775, "her old acquaintance, the attorney, who, with his family, is on board his [Dunmore's] ship," would prevent any danger of harm to Mrs. Washington. He uses facts and illustrations that it is probable were communicated to him by his son, when the latter was one of Washington's aides before Boston, and, finally, he urges reconciliation in the strongest terms, an article of Randolph's belief so strong that Jefferson regarded his departure to England somewhat in the light of a mission. "Looking with fondness towards a reconciliation with Great Britain, I cannot help hoping you may be able to contribute towards expediting the good work." Such were Jefferson's parting words to the loyalist exile, who went to London, accepted a pension of the British Government, and may justly be suspected of having forged these letters of 1776.

Here the history of the letters might well have ended, for they have thus far proved harmless; but the bitterness of party strife was to play the "body-snatcher" with them, exhuming them in one of the most critical periods of our national history. The arrival and publication, through a breach of confidence, of the Jay treaty, had thrown the country into a ferment. The French party used it for all its worth against Washington, and charged him with betraying the interests of his country to the British. The press teemed with attacks upon him and his policy, so bitterly personal in tone and vituperative in language as to excite indignation when read at this late day. None, however, wielded such a bitter pen as a little clique of "French Democrats" in Philadelphia. Duane, an Irish-American, and Bache, a connection of Benjamin Franklin, formed a partnership, and their paper, the *Aurora*, has never been surpassed, if equalled, in its libellous spirit and neglect of all proprieties. Mr. Henry Adams, in his admirable history, asserts that this paper "was the nearest approach to a modern newspaper to be found in the country," and sets him down as a "scurrilous libeller."

This precious pair undertook to destroy the influence of Washington, for they feared he might be a Presidential candidate for the third time. In 1796 appeared two volumes of the official letters of Washington to the Continental Congress during the Revolution, a compilation made by one John Carey, under the eyes of Washington and Jefferson, and designed for the English market. Naturally these volumes were reprinted in this country, and gave Duane & Co. their cue. For they republished the forged letters from the "Federalist Press," and, not content with that, compiled a good-sized volume of Washington's letters taken from the newspapers, but so garbled as to mislead the reader, and place the writer in the wrong. This volume, entitled "Epistles, Domestic, Confidential, and Official," was issued by Rivington, who must have smiled to see his old work vamped at that late day, and, without a word of explanation, placed upon the market as a complement to the Carey compilation. The exquisite irony of such an issue, in which whatever truth it contained was relegated to the appendix, must have been highly appreciated by the compilers, and they succeeded in having the volume reprinted in England.

Washington, while he was in office, took no public notice of this volume, although he made an effort to discover the perpetrator—an effort that yielded no results. But, on the day before he left the Presidency, he placed on file his declaration of the forgery, and his denial was widely published in the newspapers. Did it stop the attempts of Duane? Not at all; but to protect himself from possible consequences, he printed Washington's denial as a leaflet, and, inserting it in the fore part of his volume, continued to sell it. I have met with so few copies of the epistles containing this leaflet that it is reasonable to suppose that the sale was not very brisk after the forgeries were denounced. There is something almost pathetic in Washington's taking his pen, on the day before he retired to private life, to protest against such methods, and leave his "testimony of the truth to the present generation and to posterity." He recognized the purpose of the publishers of these forgeries: "It was then [1778] supposed to be of some consequence to strike at the integrity of the motives of the American Commander-in-Chief, and to paint his inclinations as at variance with his professions and his duty. Another crisis in the affairs of America having occurred, the same weapon has been resorted to, to wound my character and deceive the people."

The attempt was as abortive in 1796 as it was in 1778, and although the ranks of the libellers were increased by such lights as Thomas Paine and James Thomas Callender, the reputation of Washington never suffered by their attacks. Not content with his retirement, they pursued him into private life, and the farewell to Washington on his leaving the Presidency, penned by Duane, has become a classic of unseemly libel. In one respect, it must be confessed, these writers were above their successors; for in the entire range of their writings I have been unable to trace a single attack upon Mrs. Washington. The Duanes, Baches, and Callenders of to-day would not only forge letters, and libel public characters, but pursue their wives and destroy all privacy with their impertinent interference. It would be well if these later writers would adopt the chivalry of their prototypes of the last century; and better still if they could learn, from the history of these letters, that such attempts generally end in failure and come back upon their originators.

WORTHINGTON C. FORD.

THE EDINBURGH ART CONGRESS.

LONDON, November 6, 1889.

THE second Art Congress has just been brought to a close in Edinburgh. It is not very long since, in the *Nation* (October 3), in writing of the speeches made at the first Congress, and pointing out the socialistic, moral, economic, and everything but artistic tendency of many of them, I ventured to predict that very few leading artists would take part in the proceedings this year. I should like now to show briefly how fully events have justified the conclusion at which I then arrived, especially as the *Saturday Review* has objected to my prediction, based, it thinks, on the usual inaccurate information of the American correspondent, and, to prove it groundless, has given a list of names of the most distinguished artists present. But it so happens that this list supports rather than contradicts me, and I cannot do better than use it in my turn.

The Royal Academy was represented—I am quoting the *Saturday*—by Briton Riviere, Watts, Hodgson, Horsley, Richmond, Yeames, and Onslow Ford. Of these seven only three are men of any fame as artists. Onslow Ford, though perhaps his work has not crossed the ocean, is one of the most promising of the younger school of English sculptors; Richmond probably is better known; and, of course, the reputation of Watts is still more widely spread, but to what extent his present painting is held to equal it, outside of the group of his admirers, no better illustration is needed than its criticism by Mr. Coffin in his ninth paper on "The Fine Arts at the Paris Exhibition" in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the *Nation* for October 10. I find that another of the seven, Briton Riviere, also contributed to the Paris Exhibition, but Mr. Coffin did not even consider his work worth mention. As for the others, two are absolutely unknown, save by Royal Academicians and the buyers of their pictures, whoever the latter may be; while if the seventh has attained notoriety, it is not by his work, but because of his fad about the nude in art—a fad which he aired at Edinburgh, where he was indignantly silenced by a respectable Quaker lady, who told him and the delighted audience that the study of medicine in her youth had knocked all such old-woman's nonsense out of her. If these men are really to be accepted as Great Britain's leading artists, one begins to understand better all the talk about the degeneracy of British art.

William Morris and Walter Crane were the representative decorative artists in attendance. But they go to Art Congresses to preach socialism and not to talk about art. They and their followers were again in full force, and, not content with the Congress as a field for action, in the evenings they lectured upon book-illustration, house-decoration, book-binding, and printing to workmen, with closed doors. Only those who revealed by their clothes the noble fact that they lived upon their own labor and not upon the labor of others, were admitted; artists and reporters were shut out in the cold. It is a doubtful question whether men who cannot stand criticism are best fitted to consider and settle affairs of national importance.

There were no architects of note present. Among the sculptors, in addition to Onslow Ford, Stirling Lee was the only one of prominence, but he was a conspicuous figure, as he deserved to be, owing to his late unfair treatment at the hands of the phenomenally prudish Liverpool corporation. Of the Royal Scottish Academicians who attended, I doubt if any are really known, with the exception of Mr. Hole, whose fine reproductive etchings have probably been seen in New York, as well as his illustrations to Stevenson's 'Master of Ballantrae.' Promoters of the Home Arts and Industries appeared among the speakers, but, however great they may be as philanthropists, they can scarcely be ranked as leading artists, even in Great Britain. The *Saturday Review* also brings forward triumphantly the presence of three art professors among the spectators, but I notice it does not mention their names, and I hear nothing of speeches from such men as the Slade Professors, Herkomer, Middleton, and Legros, or Dr. Waldstein, who, had they gone to Edinburgh, would hardly have been allowed to remain mere spectators. The *Saturday's* list closes with the art critics, "well represented" by Mr. Andrew Lang, who, however, assured his audience he knew nothing whatever about art, and then went on to talk very charmingly of savage art; and Mr. M. H. Spielmann, who gossips about artists in one of the London evening papers, and whose first, last, and only canon of art is, "Keep on the right side of everybody!"

At last year's Congress Sir Frederick Leighton, Alma-Tadema, Hamo Thornycroft, and Alfred Gilbert—to mention no others—delivered addresses, while the principal art critics on the London press went to Liverpool in a body. And yet even the Liverpool gathering, it was felt, was not altogether representative. Great etchers like Seymour Haden and Whistler, who would have drawn after them crowds of students from all over the country, eager to listen to their every word on their art, have had nothing to do with the Congress since the very first; neither has Sargent, who, though an American, is now so very prominent in the English art world, nor Parsons, nor Stanhope Forbes, nor in fact any of the most promising of the younger men. Book-illustration was absolutely ignored, and yet Abbey lives in England. And when it comes to the art critics, where was Ruskin, who still seems to have strength enough to travel as far as Venice, though he was not heard from in Liverpool or Edinburgh? And where was Philip Gilbert Hamerton, whose name both years has been unmentioned? From the beginning the Slade Professors have not shown active interest in the movement; and this year a man like Sidney Colvin, though expected, neither went to Edinburgh nor sent a paper, so that the national museums were not adequately represented. The *Saturday's* report but confirms my statement that the Congress is being given over to faddists, moralists, social reformers, and men who seize every opportunity to add to their own notoriety, and not, as it should be, to the leading artists of the country.

It is amusing to find the *Saturday's* righteous critic cheerfully contradicting himself. After parading his great names, he adds: "Names and numbers are, however, of little importance. The questions that have to be mainly considered are, what was said by the speakers, and was it worth saying?" Most emphatically, no. Save a strong, manly speech by Onslow Ford, suggesting the appointment of a Minister of Art, and one by Stirling Lee, nothing was said which might not just as well have been left unsaid. There was what promises to be the inevitable opening sermon proclaiming the holiness and divine mission of art; and there were weak platitudes from the Marquis of Lorne, fitted, I suppose, for the Presidential post by the artistic proclivities of the Princess Louise. Mr. Watts, who could not be present in person, sent a written appeal to save the workman from drink by allowing beauty to permeate his joyless life; and Mr. Yeames showed startling ignorance of the conditions of art and artists in the past. One speaker proposed the formation of a Court of Taste in every great city (!); another, the protection of architects from quacks by a sort of licensing system. But perhaps the most noteworthy incident of the week was the courage of Mr. Hole, who openly and without fear called Ruskin and his teachings absurd. This may point to the beginning of a healthy reaction against the Soulful School of Art in England. But the struggle will be, in all probability, a desperate one. Mr. Morris was quickly on his feet to take up arms for his prophet, and the London press, rushing into the fray, declared that art for art's sake will never go down with sturdy Britons. This settles it. As long as English artists are ruled by the English public, English art exhibitions will be what they are, and English art congresses but an excuse for preaching and sentimentalizing.

N. N.

Correspondence.

A TRACE OF JOHN WASHINGTON.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Mr. Henry F. Waters's recent pamphlet on the 'Ancestry of Washington,' reprinted from the *New England Historical and Genealogical Register* for October, is of great public interest. The author desires further confirmation of his statement regarding the affiliation of John Washington of Westmoreland County, Virginia, whose will is dated 1675, proved 1677, with the Sulgrave Washingtons. All that now exists, however, are some extracts taken many years since by Bishop Meade from the original will-book, which has disappeared.

It is in this connection that, acting on the advice of two of the most eminent genealogists in New England, I call public attention to the fact that the will or letters of administration of *a* John Washington about the same period is recorded in the index of the Surrogate's office in Charleston, South Carolina. This discovery the writer of this note made in 1874, and, showing the entry in the index to one of the officials, he confirmed the date of the will as about 1680 (?). It is quite possible for this member of the Washington family to have been the original emigrant John Washington, who may have owned land in South Carolina and had his will recorded in two places. Unfortunately, in 1874 the early Charleston wills were in such confusion that, without a long search, it would have been impossible to find the original; but it is to be hoped that some diligent antiquary like Mr. Waters may discover this important paper, for which reason I now call public attention to it.

William John Potts.

Camden, N. J., November 15, 1889.

LOCKRAM AND *LOCKRUM.*

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: A reference to the dictionaries of the English dialects should satisfy those who are in doubt about these words. Of the fabric called *lockram* there seems to have been a fine sort as well as a coarse. *Lockrum*, signifying "nonsense, gibberish, rigmarole," is common in the Midland counties, and thence, no doubt, was exported to the New World. Sometimes it is used attributively, as in Edward Ward's *Hudibras Redivivus* (1707), vol. i., canto ix.:

> "After he'd made a little Pause,
> Again he stretch'd his *Lockrum* Jaws.
> But now, says he, 'tis worth your Wonder
> T'observe how th' Lord brings Tyrants under,
> As Ahaz, Jeroboam, Saul,
> Jehoram, and the Dev'l and all,
> Who were so wicked, that they valu'd
> Religion only as a Ballad."

That Ward meant *lockram* is, however, a position which may find advocates. But, after all, until better informed, I am disposed to consider *lockram* and *lockrum* as one and the same word, with two senses, a primary and a figurative. In this case it may be compared with *bombast*, *buckram*, *fustian*, and *shoddy*.

—Your obedient servant, F. H.

Marlesford, England, November 8, 1889.

BE DONE AND *HAVE DONE.*

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: There is no higher authority for English usage than your correspondent "F. H." He is quite right in what he says about "have done." When I first saw in print the letter on which he comments, I made the same criticism on it that he has made. What I certainly meant to write, as it is what I should certainly say, was "be obliged and done with it." The awkward repetition of the "be" was, I am sure, unconscious. Had I chosen the pedagogic instead of the conversational form, I should have written "be obliged and have done with it."

I remain, your obedient servant,

J. R. Lowell.

INTERNATIONAL IGNORANCE AGAIN.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: "H. G. H.'s" story in the *Nation* of November 7, of English ignorance of our geography, needs to be capped by a story of some American ignorance of foreign parts, in order to justify the adjective "international." Per-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

haps most of us are fitted for the position of hero, even "H. G. H." himself.

Australia is an English-speaking continent second in importance only to the United States among the commonwealths making up Greater Britain. If we demand of an Englishman that he should know that the Rockies are not in sight from the Hudson, and are even more than 400 miles away, should we not expect of an American, "H. G. H.," for instance, that he should be able to tell:

(1.) Whether Australia is larger or smaller than the United States?

(2.) Whether Tasmania is in sight from its shores, or is 400 miles away or more?

(3.) Whether the distance between Australia and New Zealand is comparable to that between the Hudson and the Rockies, or whether it is 400 miles or less?

(4.) Whether Melbourne is in sight from the mountains about Sydney, or whether it is 400 miles away, or as far away as the Rockies are from the Hudson, etc.

Yet, can "H. G. H." answer these questions without putting down the *Nation* to take up an atlas? G.

COLORADO SPRINGS, November 12, 1889.

THE TARIFF ON AMERICAN SCHOLARSHIP.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the *Nation* for October 24 (p. 335), you furnish your readers with an instructive illustration of the peculiar kind of encouragement given to scholarship by our laws, in the account of the fine of $1.25 imposed upon Dr. Maurice Bloomfield for importing two proof copies of his text-edition of the 'Kāuçika Sūtra.' Certainly no parallel to this transaction could be discovered in the Treasury Department records of any other nation, civilized or uncivilized.

It may not be out of place to point out, in this connection, that if the Senate Act of May 9, 1888—the so-called International Copyright Act—had passed the House of Representatives as well, Dr. Bloomfield would not only have been made to pay into the Treasury of the United States one-fourth of the value of every copy of his work which he might import, but, in return for his temerity in having his book printed in the *only* country, perhaps, where Sanskrit printing could readily and cheaply be done, he would have been called upon to forfeit his entire copyright. That is to say, he would have lost the only legal property equivalent he could show for his five years or more of arduous labor, and, moreover, been forced to surrender the power to control the use—however fraudulent or abusive—made by other persons of the results of that labor. *

THE COPYRIGHT IN BAGEHOT'S WRITINGS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your reviewer is quite right in requiring visible evidence in the matter of Bagehot copyright, and I cannot charge him with my own negligence. I possess, however, cordially appreciative letters from Mr. Hutton and Mrs. Bagehot, and expect to publish the latter's permission on the next lot, to be printed shortly. The neglect of this was not due to any sharp practice, but to the fact that the overworked editor, like Virgil's Rhadamanthus, did his task wrong end first, and accomplished it before asking any questions.

"De gustibus non"—but with regard to the portrait, which I am very sorry does not do credit to our intention and expense (we *paid* for a first-rate one), it may be interesting to know that Mr. Hutton, surely a competent judge, pronounces it "admirable." It was engraved from the Woodburytype frontispiece to the 'Literary Studies'; well or ill engraved I must not debate.

May I add that a time when the highest and most sacred things—the chair of national Government and the pulpit of God—are being degraded to advertising purposes, is exactly the one when somebody ought to elevate advertising out of its mire of uncleanly associations? When grand viziers use their positions to sell "pants," and religious advisers to job stocks, a business company may justly feel some pride in a dignified and valuable service to the public, irrelevant to its business, for which it asks only respect and good-will. They pull their employments into the mud; we raise the least dignified part of ours out of it.

Truly yours, FORREST MORGAN.

WORDSWORTH VS. SCOTT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Without seeking to impugn the general validity of Mr. Savage's remarks upon Wordsworth and Japanese art, in the *Nation* of November 14 (although they seem to me somewhat far-fetched), suffer me a word in defence of one whom Wordsworth unjustly attacks. I mean Scott.

It has been the fashion for half a century, ever since Carlyle's heinous review of Lockhart's 'Life,' to sneer at Scott, until one wonders whether our grandfathers might not have been out of their senses to find aught good in him. It is high time that an end should come to this pitiful delusion. As to Wordsworth, profoundly as we may admire the poet in him, we need not accept the man at his own valuation. In truth, Wordsworth could be at times insufferably narrow-minded and fault-finding towards his contemporaries. Mr. Savage quotes his strictures upon Scott's method:

"He [Scott] took pains; he went out with his pencil and note-book and jotted down whatever struck him. . . . He went home and wove the whole into a poetical description. But nature does not permit an inventory to be made of her charms. He should have left his pencil and note-book at home, . . . and taken all into a heart that could understand and enjoy," etc., etc.

Moral: Write from memory!

The curious feature of all this is that Wordsworth is belaboring a straw-man of his own creation. The real Scott did *not* do what he is represented as doing. If ever there was a writer who trusted to the stored-up treasures of his memory, gathered in Wordsworth's own ideal manner, it was Scott. In only one instance, to my knowledge, did he write otherwise. And even this instance would never have been known to Wordsworth had it not been recorded by Lockhart. The scene of 'Rokeby' is laid in England. Scott visited the place in the autumn of 1812, as the guest of his old friend, the owner, Mr. Morritt. From the latter's Memoirs Lockhart quotes:

"The morning after he [Scott] arrived, he said: 'You have often given me materials for romance; now I want a good robber's cave and an old church of the right sort.' We rode out, and he found what he wanted in the ancient slate-quarries of Brignal and the ruined Abbey of Egglestone. I observed him noting down even the peculiar little wild flowers and herbs that accidentally grew round and on the side of a bold crag near his intended cave of Guy Denzil; and could not help saying that, as he was not to be upon oath in his work, daisies, violets, and primroses would be as poetical as any of the humble-plants he was examining. I laughed, in short, at his scrupulousness; but I understood him when he replied 'that in Nature herself no two scenes are exactly alike, and that whoever copied truly what was before his eyes would possess the same variety in his descriptions, and exhibit apparently an imagination as boundless as the range of nature in the scenes he recorded; whereas whoever trusted to imagination would soon find his own mind circumscribed and contracted to a few favorite images, and the repetition of these would sooner or later produce that very monotony and barrenness which had haunted descriptive poetry in the hands of any but the most patient worshipper of truth.'"

And from a letter of Scott's to Morritt, November 29, 1812, it appears that Scott cancelled in type and rewrote a page of 'Rokeby' in order to make his mention of the watercourses tally with the facts.

This 'Rokeby' passage is unique, I believe, in Scott's life. We must remember that Scott was undertaking to describe a scene with which he was not familiar. We may rest assured that when Scott's foot was on his native heath, he never had need of pencil and note-book, but trusted to a memory that seldom deceived.

Wordsworth, in the passage above noted, goes on to expatiate upon the *advantages* of trusting to memory, that useful faculty having the happy gift of eliminating the "accidental" and retaining only the "ideal and essential." It may be worth while for the Wordsworthians to apply this theory to the theorizer himself. In Wordsworth's exquisite "Yarrow Visited," the downright sincerity of the opening stanza is marred by the pious ejaculation:

> "O that some minstrel's harp were near,
> To utter notes of gladness,
> And chase this silence from the air
> That fills my heart with sadness."

Was not James Hogg, the Ettrick Shepherd, of the party, ready at a sign to break the oppressive silence with his piping? But Wordsworth needed the silence, and his memory supplied it, by eliminating the accidental Hogg. And twenty years later the same memory, in "Extempore Effusion," sang:

> "When first descending from the moorlands
> I saw the stream of Yarrow glide
> Along a bare and open valley,
> The Ettrick Shepherd was my guide."

Another sample of Wordsworth's peculiar memory may not be superfluous. Scott, in quoting from "Yarrow Unvisited," got the famous lines,

> "The swan on still St. Mary's Lake
> Floats double, swan and shadow,"

into

> "The *swans* on *sweet* St. Mary's Lake
> Float double, swan and shadow."

Wordsworth criticised the blunder twice—once rightly, once wrongly—rightly, when he laid the stress on the "sweet," pronouncing it commonplace and meaningless, whereas "still" was necessary for the perfect image in the water; wrongly, when he laid stress upon the plural "swans," saying: "Never could I have written 'swans' in the plural. The scene *when I saw it* . . . was one of utter loneliness; there was *one* swan, and one only, stemming the water. . . . Had there been many swans and many shadows, they would have implied nothing as regards the character of the place, and I should have said nothing about them." And he wound up with the memorable utterance: "I have hardly ever known any one but myself who had a true eye for Nature—one that thoroughly understood her meanings and her teachings."

Extraordinary indeed! I have ventured to italicize the clause "*when I saw it.*" Did Wordsworth actually forget that he was discussing lines from his poem upon Yarrow *unvisited*! And did he mean to insinuate that Scott and other ordinary mortals with fallible eyesight had never seen a flock of swans on St. Mary's Lake? Besides, in "Yarrow Unvisit-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ed," the poet is not describing a scene of desolation. He is rather alluding to the lake in a hasty summing-up and in a decidedly *humorous* tone. As for the "sweet," Scott's memory, doubtless, tripped over the lines immediately preceding:

"Let beeves and home-bred kine partake
The sweets of Burn-mill Meadow."

I am far from undervaluing Wordsworth's poetry. It has, indeed, an ineffable charm and glory all its own. But I must hold that we shall fare more safely if we trust less implicitly to his oracular didactic strictures upon other men.

J. M. HART.

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI, November 18, 1889.

DESOLATE FARM SITES IN NEW ENGLAND.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: What has been said in the *Nation* about the decline of farming in New Hampshire and Vermont has attracted attention at home and abroad, and if the subject is of interest to readers in France, it must be doubly so to Yankees born and bred in the very localities you have mentioned. From the responses so awakened one might infer that the abandonment of New England farms was "a modern instance," and only recently worthy of comment, while the causes set forth seem to me equally misleading.

The period of my youth was spent upon a farm situated in a school district just north of Monadnock Mountain in New Hampshire. We attended school in a little brick school-house which the School Committee reported as "situated a mile from any human habitation and much secluded by hills and forests." The number of pupils during those years (1857 to 1865) ranged from five to fifteen, but we were accustomed to be told on "examination days" how this school-house had in times past held eighty or more pupils at a time. A curiosity to know where they could have come from led to the discovery, within one mile of this school-house, of nine "old cellar-holes," and, within a radius of one and a-half miles, of seventeen. Two years since, I took another inventory, and found that there are now not less than twenty-three old farm sites within the last-named radius. About these spots, where in most cases large, well-made houses stood, filled with strapping boys and buxom girls, still linger some vestiges of former days—a scraggy orchard, a lonely rose-bush, or a sentinel shade tree—to tell where the husbandman and housewife *ceased* to plant and tend fifteen, forty, and sixty years ago.

It should be borne in mind that this locality was always purely agricultural; a blacksmith's shop where farmers' wagons were ironed and their oxen shod, if an exception, being the only one. The soil, too, produced fair corn and other crops, and was, generally speaking, productive. Good crops of hay are still cut where the plough has not been used for twenty years, and cattle grow fat in pastures grazed for generations. The schools in town always had more than a local reputation; roads were generally good and taxes reasonable. Moreover, the condition of the farmers who remain disputes the statement of "G. W. A.," "that it is to-day an absolute impossibility for a healthy man, by average industry and prudence, to live with ordinary comfort and lay by enough to see him through his old age on a New England farm." They have money in the savings banks, Western mortgages and other investments, have good buildings, well-stocked farms, and a thousand comforts *unknown* to the average Western farmer.

I have lived in Windsor County, Vermont, and there are few localities in the New England States about which I do not know something from *actual observation;* and I say confidently that the above statement of facts (which any one can verify) about a single school district in the town of Dublin, County of Cheshire, and State of New Hampshire, presents a case typical (generally speaking) of the rural districts throughout New England.

We have heard cited as "among the main causes of this decline" the burdens of direct and indirect taxation; but how a farmer, by migrating and plying his vocation in some other State, could escape these burdens, is to me a mystery. The affliction of the tariff is a sore one to the farmer, but it falls as heavily upon him in Colorado and Illinois as in Vermont. Roads, schools, and public works are made and maintained by direct taxation in every part of the United States, and it is as easy to hide one's farm or personalty from the assessor in one place as in another.

Unquestionably that product of "refined and enlightened selfishness," the tariff, silenced the sound of industry in every ship-yard along our New England seaboard; and this, with the discovery of petroleum and the destruction of the sperm whale, let loose a band of half-lumbermen, half-whalemen, and half-farmers, who left their half-tilled acres for something more congenial to their uneasy spirits. But the main causes which we seek are broader and deeper. They inhere:

(1.) In the change of method and extension of agriculture, and its broadened relations to commerce.

(2.) In the opportunity for enterprise and speculation in other lines which was contemporaneously developed.

(3.) In an education which enabled the New England farmer boy to change his vocation, seize upon and possess this opportunity.

The economic conditions of trade and agriculture have been revolutionized by science within a hundred years. Improved machinery and methods have made it possible to farm more acres, or make a single acre more productive with the same labor. The art of canning, in its multifarious uses, preserves and makes transportable products otherwise perishable. The vast fields which formerly produced madder and other vegetable pigments and dyestuffs, have been converted into grain fields by the discovery of aniline dyes and mineral paints. But over and above all this and much more of the same tenor, the tremendous strides made in improved methods of communication, travel, and transportation have added an enormous and increasing annual increment of new farms—new farms in Australia, new farms in Africa, new farms in South America, and new farms in North America, all bidding for a rating in the same market—until to-day the merchant in Lombard Street may, in the morning, consult his factors in Minneapolis, Montevideo, and Melbourne about some farm product, and in the afternoon order his supply from Cape Town or Bombay.

The new opportunities for enterprise and activity, super-agricultural, so to speak, which were developed alongside, sometimes in advance, of this opening of new ploughed fields, were fitted to stir and satisfy the largest imagination and the greatest range of tastes and ability. The margin of profit for the mere farmer grew narrower, and his vocation more mechanical and less interesting, but the sphere of human activity in every other direction was immeasurably widened. A time came, therefore, when the New Englander asked himself not, Where is the fittest farm, but Where is a fitter vocation?

Such a race of readers, thinkers, and misers never before tilled the soil; and farmers' sons were never before so perfectly equipped by practical training and education to change their calling, to adapt themselves to new social and economic conditions, to see; to seize, and to possess an opportunity the grandest and most varied ever offered. These farmers' sons left the farms to establish newspapers, to build railroads, to open mines, to organize banks and trust companies, to build up manufactories and found cities; and in every undertaking throughout this broad land, and other lands, where energy, brains, coöperation, and capital have been called for, their history is written. The first to leave the old homestead did so somewhat regretfully, somewhat with formality. But when, laden with golden, official, and diplomatic honors, they came home to speak in the Sunday-schools, fresco churches, build free libraries, and tell their story, all ceremony in going was forgotten. Farmers burned their buildings for the insurance, so that companies in Vermont failed or closed down, and in New Hampshire refused to pay even honest losses, until a valued-policy law was enacted. A powerful and impelling motive, which should be studied in connection with the foregoing, was an intense, bred-in-the-bone desire to get rich. No class known to history ever possessed a keener appetite for accumulation than those who hoed corn and potatoes in New England.

To speak of legislative remedies is useless: time alone can make the adjustment. When the new and cheaper lands of the world have been occupied, the hills of New England may again be inhabited, but it must be by a home-loving, unambitious people, who are satisfied to live in accordance with the conditions fixed by the law of supply and demand for those who till the soil in other parts of the earth.

WALTER C. FROST.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COL., November 18, 1889.

DESERTED FARMS IN NEW YORK.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The following clipping is from the county news column of the Lyons *Republican* for November 22. It shows that agricultural depression is not confined to New England, but that even in the richest part of New York State something is the matter:

"In the rural districts in Wayne County there are no less than 400 empty houses. It is a lamentable fact that the rural population of Wayne County is slowly drifting into the larger towns and cities, while many are going West in search of cheaper homes or fortunes. The town of Sodus alone has over fifty deserted houses, and Huron has thirty or more. The next census will show a marked decrease in the rural population as compared with ten years ago."—Yours truly, M. A. VEEDER.

LYONS, N. Y., November 23, 1889.

THE FARMER AND HIS TAXES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The ingenious and convincing arguments in favor of a closer connection between the legislative and executive departments of our Government, which "G. B." has deduced from events absolutely irrelevant (to the ordinary mind), have long been the object of my admiration. But his explanation of the decline of prosperity in New Hampshire and Vermont does not carry conviction to my mind; nor can I believe there is any remedy so easily applicable as a mere change in the tax laws. Every one admits the great difficulty of adjust-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing taxes equitably. It is the recognition of this difficulty, rather than any clear understanding of the underlying theory of right of ownership in land, that is giving Henry George's single-tax scheme its popular success in many States. If we admit that land belongs rightfully, not to individuals but to mankind, we can then justify a tax which is properly the rent of the land. But putting all rights in property on the same basis, it is not easy to see how the State can justly tax one part and suffer another part to go free; nor is the expediency of such a scheme obvious on any other than protectionist principles, which assume that certain kinds of industries should be sacrificed for the sake of other kinds.

"G. B." states that "all that gives land any value is the quick capital employed on it." Possibly. But why is "quick capital" employed on some land and not on other? Chiefly because some land is adapted by the nature of the soil or by its location to serve the uses of mankind. The presence of quick capital is primarily an *effect*, not a cause, and an effect of causes in which taxation or non-taxation is a very insignificant element. "G. B.'s" argument for the non-taxation of personal property in order that "quick capital" may flow in, exactly reduces to the protectionist argument—*i. e.*, that by taxing agricultural industries and favoring manufacturing industries, the value of the land will be raised by the creation of a local market. There is a plausibility about this argument, and I confess I have been at times nonplussed to find the facts directly controverting it.

The most striking feature of the decline of the farming interests in New England is that this decline is *not* the greatest in districts remote from the cities and villages where "quick capital" is aggregated—rather the reverse. It is astonishing, in driving five miles out from Lowell, Lawrence, Manchester, or any other of our thriving manufacturing towns, to find deserted farm-houses, abandoned fields, and all the evidences of decay in even greater profusion than in the "back districts." But such is the fact. The causes are, I think, mainly two:

(1.) As I said in my former letter, there is no such thing to-day as a *local market*. The means of transportation are so efficient that we find the products of the whole world in every inland town; fruits and vegetables are sold at moderate prices in our villages before they are green in leaf on our New England farms. Even milk is carried a hundred miles, and whatever advantage might accrue to the former from having a *comparatively local* market for this product, is taken from him by the combination of the milk contractors. No manufacturing town can flourish without railroads, and railroads mean that farm products are to be raised where Nature has given the greatest advantages for raising them, which is not in New England.

(2.) The nearer the city is, the sooner the farmer finds out that he is not gaining the return for his labor that other men are. The farmer back from the towns knows little of the world's opportunities, and so struggles on, fighting against fate, the assessor, and the tariff (though of the last he seems deplorably unconscious). Thus it is that we find the back towns less decayed than those near the cities. I was not a little surprised to observe this, last summer, on driving from Lowell to Boston, through a country gridironed with railroads, with thriving towns only a few miles apart, but the country lying between them showing in many cases no accompanying prosperity.

Moreover, "G. B.'s" remedy is practically tried in many towns by exempting from taxation, for a series of years, the plants of manufacturing companies. It is generally agreed, I think, among careful observers, that this policy is not advantageous to the farmer. The intelligent owner of one of the best farms in a New Hampshire town which has fostered in this way a manufacturing village, lately told me that he found almost no advantage in the supposed local market; that the growth of the village required a large outlay for streets, sewers, etc., and that the farmer was taxed to pay for these, so that the last state of that town was much worse than the first.

I have no hesitation in saying that the removal of the tax on clothing and on iron would do more to arrest the decay of New England farming interests than any new adjustment of direct taxation—not to say a new adjustment that would throw a still heavier burden on the farming interests. G. W. A.

Boston, November 18, 1889.

DIVORCED WORKINGWOMEN.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Perhaps the "Doubter" of your last issue will find an answer to his question in relation to the statistics of divorced workingwomen if he will turn to the first page of the Introduction in the fifth annual report of the Commissioner of Labor, reading as follows:

"The investigation is representative so far as the number of women whose affairs enter into it is concerned. The total number of such is 17,427, being from *6 to 7 per cent. of the whole number of women* engaged in the class of work coming under observation in the cities named."

The "Doubter" should rather doubt his own eyes than another man's written words which he has not even seen, or, having seen, has failed to understand. E. P. A.

Pittsburgh, November 19, 1889.

PEDAGOGY AT THE UNIVERSITIES.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: May I make, in the columns of your paper, a brief protest against the indifference of our colleges to the study of pedagogy?

I shall speak principally of Harvard, not because she is more worthy of censure in this respect than other colleges, but because I know her better. Looking at the Harvard of to-day, we find, in addition to the college or undergraduate department, a Law School, a Medical School, a Divinity School, a Scientific School, a Dental School, a School of Agriculture and Horticulture, and a School of Veterinary Science. If we ask ourselves to what extent these schools fit graduates of the College for the professions actually chosen by them, we find our answer in the statistics of the class reports. These reports tell us that teaching is universally more popular than any other profession, excepting those of the law and medicine, and that it is more popular than medicine even, in six cases out of twelve. Any one interested in the profession of teaching naturally asks himself why it is that this subject—more popular than the ministry, science, dentistry, agriculture, or veterinary science, for the study of which special schools have been established at a large expense—receives absolutely no attention at the University.

The fact that teaching comes second or third on the list, although sufficient to show that some preparation for it should be provided, by no means shows the full importance of the subject. When we call to mind the very large number of college graduates who, though not teachers themselves, are serving on school committees as directors of teachers, and of the still larger number who as parents are directing the education of children, is it unreasonable for us to demand not only that a special course of instruction shall be provided for those who intend to become teachers, but also that a part of every man's college course shall consist of studies that will enable him to form a few general ideas at least of the proper way to develop a human mind? Can any one deny that a man will become a better teacher, a more valuable member of a school committee, or a more judicious parent, from studying such writers as Pestalozzi, Froebel, Richter, Spencer, and Joseph Payne? It appears to me that ignorance of what these men thought is as culpable in a teacher or professor as ignorance of Blackstone in a lawyer.

I do not see how a university can fail to recognize the importance of this subject even to its own life and self-preservation. Invidious comparisons are beginning to be made between the teaching ability of the school-teacher and of the college professor. A superintendent of schools, who is a graduate of Harvard, tells me that the instruction given by his primary teachers is vastly superior in quality to that received by him when he was an undergraduate. A recent graduate of Harvard says:

"It is a fact, I think, which will not be denied by any one who has suffered for four years at the hands of the average college instructor, that much, if not most, of the teaching done in our colleges is of an exceedingly low grade. It will not compare favorably with the teaching in our best preparatory schools, and is certainly far inferior to that performed by the best trained teachers in our elementary public schools. . . . One of the most important reasons for this state of things is to be found in an almost total lack of any preparatory instruction in the art and science of education on the part of those who are to fill our academic and college positions. The remedy is to be sought in the establishment of chairs of pedagogy in our colleges and universities."

A college man who led his class for the four years he was in college says that he learned more of a certain subject from teaching it three weeks to a sub-freshman than he did from studying the same subject in college for a whole year. I would not set undergraduates at work teaching sub-freshmen; but if there is a method of studying a subject by which a college man can learn as much in three weeks as he now learns in a year, is not that a method of mental development worth studying and imitating by the professor?

The discouraging part of college teaching from a pedagogical standpoint is, that whenever a college professor does teach well, he is considered to do so rather on account of his individuality than because he teaches in accordance with the fundamental laws of pedagogy; his example is almost wholly lost on his fellow-teachers. In the same department we often see as many fundamentally different methods as there are teachers. In the public schools the outlook is more hopeful; there unmistakable progress in specific directions has been made. As a result of study, organization, and supervision, we no longer see the a-b-c method of teaching reading, for instance; even this step would not have been taken if every teacher were a free-lance, as appears to be the case with the college professor. Have our colleges in the same period of time taken any universally recognized progressive step in the science and art of teaching that will begin to compare in importance with this step taken by the public schools?

Is it not a common thing for a graduate of a college to find, a few years after graduation, that he remembers almost nothing of most of the subjects he has studied in college? Is it possible for a man to devote as much time to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any branch of manual training as is devoted to a year's study of any subject in college without retaining all his life some special power in the direction in which he has worked? Ought there not to be a lasting specific result in the one case as well as in the other? I have by no means lost sight of the great progress made in recent years at Harvard and other universities; but this progress is rather in the direction of the employment of high-priced specialists in subjects studied by only a few students, of a larger number of courses of instruction, and of expensive dormitories, which tend to increase the cost of college life, than of a better knowledge and application of the laws of mental development by the aid of which the greatest good may be done to the greatest number.

I was much surprised at an address recently made by President Eliot of Harvard, agreed to and commended by President Dwight of Yale, at a meeting of the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, in which he is reported as saying: "I notice the methods of teaching the principal subjects have fundamentally changed at Harvard within twenty years, and I suppose it is the case in other colleges. If, therefore, we are right in our present methods, what good would it do to teach the old methods? . . . It is by developing new methods of teaching subjects that colleges make teachers best equipped for their work. . . . Is teaching a profession when the majority of teachers are elected once a year? . . . I say, therefore, that the institutions of higher education have some good reason for not attempting to teach the philosophy of education."

I beg leave to take exception to President Eliot's conclusions, and to the uninspiring, non-professional tone of his whole address, which is in marked contrast with the spirit of progress and untiring energy shown by him in other directions. One of his best professors, whom he must have had in mind when speaking of improved methods, tells me that he could have saved himself years of (to his pupils) unprofitable experiment in the classroom if, before beginning to teach, he had stopped to study even for a short time the philosophy of teaching.—Yours respectfully,

X. Y. A.

KENTUCKY CIVILIZATION.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I have read your strictures upon the Swope-Goodloe fight, and, while agreeing with you as to the deplorable character of such occurrences, I must take issue with those who intimate that they are proofs of a low order of civilization in the communities in which they take place. Civilization is a complex affair, and a good many elements enter into its composition. A regard for human life, or, if the phrase be preferred, a willingness to transfer to society the duty of rectifying the wrongs of the individual, may be one of them, though a contrary opinion is entertained not only in Kurdistan, but also by certain influential classes in France and Germany, who still look upon that modified form of street fight called the duel as the proper way of settling private quarrels. But even if this were not the case, and we admit that a due regard for the sacredness of human life is one of the lines over which a people must pass in the advance from barbarism to civilization, we must not forget that it is only one of such lines, and consequently that progress along it does not authorize a general conclusion as to the civilization, or want of civilization, of any given people. Unquestionably, their opinion upon this point may indicate the position which they have reached in this particular direction; but inasmuch as it does not imply a corresponding advance along any other line of development, it does not enable us to fix definitely their place in the scale of civilization.

That this view is not without a solid foundation of fact will be evident to any one who will take the trouble to consider the effect of the same line of argument applied to ourselves. Take, for instance, the recent foot-ball game between Harvard and Princeton, when the students of these two colleges accused each other of trying to smuggle professional players upon their respective teams. Such an act, if true, was dishonorable; and yet the charge was made in good faith, and what makes the matter worse is the fact that it was and still is believed. In other words, the students of two of the leading colleges of the North do not hesitate to characterize each other as scoundrels. Now, Mr. Editor, I am not squeamish in such matters; but what ought to be thought of a state of society in which some thousands of the first young men in the community are believed to have been guilty of a crime that would hardly be tolerated in a gambling hell? That there is such a thing as being "too handy with the pistol" is admitted, and that there are a good many Kentuckians who are thus "handy" is no doubt true; but, with all due deference, it seems to me that there are some things that are more precious than life, and, unless I have mistaken the teachings of the *Nation*, personal honor is one of them.

But while entertaining a decided opinion as to the unfairness of the method by which Kentucky's place in the scale of civilization is so often fixed, it must not be supposed that I am ignorant of the prevalence in all that region of the idea of personal accountability, or that I am oblivious of the causes that are believed to have contributed to its origin and development. Leaving out of consideration the "old Adam" inherent in most of us, and of which the Kentuckian has a full share, it is probable that not a little of this combative spirit has come down from the times when the ever-present danger of an Indian attack made it necessary for every man to be prepared to fight for his life at a moment's notice. This school in which the first Kentuckians took their lessons was hard and stern, but it engendered a feeling of self-reliance, a sense of the necessity of immediate personal action under any and all circumstances, from which has come the exaggerated idea of the importance of the individual, as distinguished from society, to which so many of these bloody encounters may be referred.

Were it necessary to pursue this subject further, it might be urged that this notion of personal importance has been intensified by the life which the people of that State have uniformly led. They have always been farmers, and as moralists tell us that criminal offences are, to some extent, the outgrowth of the physical conditions of the society in which they exist, it is perhaps safe to say that one reason why the crimes that prevail among the better classes south of the Ohio differ from those that characterize the same classes in the business centres of the North, is to be found in the difference in the occupations, mode of life, and worldly interests of the people of the two sections. Thus, for instance, in a commercial, manufacturing community, like many of those that exist in New England and the other Northern States, the crimes, as a rule, are against property; while in the South, where different interests prevail, as well as in the agricultural regions of the Northwest, the crimes are more often against the person.

But it is not my purpose to institute a comparison between the different sections; neither do I wish to be understood as advocating the reintroduction of the shotgun mode of settling disputes into those communities in which, owing to a change in conditions, it has fallen into disuse. What I do insist upon, though, is the injustice of measuring the progress of a people by the standard of those who live under different conditions; and I protest against the practice of visiting the sins of a few fierce and ungovernable natures upon an entire community. Such methods savor of provincialism, and generally do harm.—Yours, etc.,

Lucien Carr.

Cambridge, Mass., November 21, 1889.

[There is little to be said in answer to this letter except that it assails a position which the *Nation* has not taken. We have all along treated this readiness of prominent and educated men at the South to shed blood in quarrels as "puzzling" and "mysterious," in view of the fact that it does not fit into the civilization of the community as expressed in other ways. The men wear black broadcloth, get their meat at the butcher's, have churches, schools and colleges, and libraries, live under an organized government by discussion, are in close communication with the great centres of civilization, and yet quarrel after the fashion of Albanians or Kurds. How and why is this? we have a dozen times asked Southern sociologists, and we never get a satisfactory answer. We have never said that this readiness to shed blood argued general barbarism or want of civilization. On the contrary, we have frequently drawn attention to the fact that it did not do so as something extremely curious. Mr. Carr's comparison of the compulsion under which men live in Kentucky to be ready for street fights, to the compulsion under which men live in France and Germany to fight duels, does not contain much comfort for him. Only a very small class in either of these countries feel this compulsion, and in both countries the Swope-Goodloe affair would be considered a foul and brutal murder. The French duel, in fact, is a bit of social play for Parisian journalists and politicians which would be stopped in a month if it were really dangerous. The rule which treats the smallest wound as creating a condition of inequality making the fight unfair, in truth converts the ordinary French duel into a simple fencing bout.—Ed. Nation.]

Notes.

'Justice and Jurisprudence,' being "an enquiry concerning the Constitutional limitations of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments," is in the press of J. B. Lippincott Co.

A new guide-book to Florida, by Chas. Ledyard Norton, on the plan of Baedeker, will be published next month by Longmans, Green & Co.

D. Appleton & Co. have in press a work by Mr. Frank Vincent, entitled 'Around and about South America.' Mr. Vincent circumnavigated the entire continent, visiting every

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

place of interest in the different countries. A large and richly illustrated volume will embody his observations.

Recent announcements by B. G. Teubner, Leipzig (New York: Westermann), are a 'Lexicon Livianum,' based on Hillebrand's unpublished MS., by F. Fügner, and an 'Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz,' by Alfred Holder. The latter will be five years in publishing. Another work to attract attention is Sybel's 'Die Begründung des Deutschen Reichs durch Wilhelm I.,' of which the first two volumes have just appeared, and three more are completed in manuscript. This will be well fortified by official documents, and the distinguished author promises a good many surprises.

We have received the reprint of the late Prof. Alexander Johnston's summary article in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' called, in its present book form, 'The United States: its History and Constitution' (Charles Scribner's Sons). It ended with the year 1887, but that may be considered quite to date. The bibliography is the portion which might have been enlarged to advantage and rearranged, since the need of compression no longer existed. An index has been provided, and on this, too, we should have been glad to see a little more pains bestowed.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co. have bound up in one pair of covers Emerson's First and Second Series of 'Essays.' The thinnish paper does not blur the page, and the purchaser gets in return a reduced price for an excellent edition from the best plates. The binding is in brown cloth and tasteful.

Blackmore's romance 'Lorna Doone' has been chosen as the subject of an experiment in fine book-making west of the Alleghanies (Cleveland: The Burrows Bros. Co.). The externals of this heavy volume, which demands a book-rest in reading, are very successful. The page is, to our eyes, too solid, and sacrifices too much to broad margins. The paper is open to the objection of being too glossy, and perhaps also of unpleasantness of tint. The illustrations imply pains and expense, and are often very good indeed, particularly the initial letters, and on the whole they will be adjudged the best part of the total achievement. The publishers have rightly thought that a map of the scene of the story would be a useful accompaniment, and have prefixed a good one. They can but be congratulated on the general result of their undertaking.

A charming edition of Alfred de Vigny's 'Cinq Mars,' in William Hazlitt's translation, has just been published by Little, Brown & Co., Boston. The two volumes are bound in wine-colored cloth, richly stamped in gilt, and are illustrated by a high order of designs by A. Dawant, etched by Gaujean, as well as by a portrait of the author, and numerous head-pieces on wood. The University Press, Cambridge, has done its best for the beauty and perfection of the typography here as in the case of the Dumas series issued by the same house. De Vigny's notes and historical documents are reproduced with this edition of the novel.

A new translation of M. Ludovic Halévy's 'L'Abbé Constantin' is published by Dodd, Mead & Co. It is a handsome volume, though the paper is perhaps a little too thick and too much glazed. The abundant illustrations are by Mme. Madeleine Lemaire, and may fairly enough be called clever, even if they are of less than the highest originality and distinction. The good Abbé, in particular, is rather a lay-figure. The two sisters are better expressed, and the young soldier, Jean.

The 'Good Things from *Life*' make a sixth series (Frederick A. Stokes & Bro.). The massing of these "process" reproductions of pen-drawings reminds us once more of the destructive effect of facsimile on artistic individuality. The dead sameness in appearance of the minor illustrations of *Puck*, *Judge*, and *Life* would have been impossible under the old fashion of engraving everything on wood. Amid the flood of designs in this volume which appeal to one's sense of the ludicrous only by the legend beneath, one meets here and there, like antediluvian relics, droll vignettes which speak for themselves or illustrate a punning caption. The most of these are signed "Chip," and they would all have been the better for being cut instead of "processed."

'Wild Flowers of the Pacific Coast,' by Emma Homan Thayer (Cassell & Co.), might be classed among books for young folks, with reference to the character of the text which accompanies the twenty-four colored plates. The writer relates trifling incidents occurring at various noted places in Southern and Central California, and connects them with the finding of some particularly lovely flower which she proceeds to sketch on the spot in water colors. Some of these tales are rather naïve, but a boy or girl reading them all will get sufficient information about California to become eager to visit it, if for no other reason than to see its beautiful flora. Where there was such an *embarras de richesses*, the choice of two dozen representatives was not an easy one, but has been judiciously made. The execution of the sketches and the printing are less commendable. No one could from these plates get more than a faint idea of the wondrous beauty of the Mariposa lily and the so-called wild verbena, as regards either their graceful forms or delicate coloring. The blood-red Sierra snow-plant, perhaps the most curious of California's floral gems, is more successfully reproduced, but on looking for information regarding it the reader will find two pages about the Yosemite Falls and Glacier Point, but only half-a-dozen lines about the plant; and to appease the curiosity inevitably aroused by so strange a flower he will have to consult Hutchinson's 'Heart of the Sierras,' where its habits are fully described.

'A Reader in Botany,' by Miss Jane H. Newell (Ginn & Co.), traces, by means of selections from well-known authors, the life history of a plant from seed to leaf. Darwin, Sachs, Kerner von Marilaun, Cooke, and Shaler are represented in this little work by interesting chapters, which are supplemented by carefully prepared pages from the pen of the compiler; the whole leading the reader by the easiest conceivable steps to the more striking phases presented by living plants. It is to be hoped that the second volume, treating of the flower, will follow speedily.

'Timber and Some of its Diseases,' by Prof. H. Marshall Ward (Macmillan), is a praiseworthy work in every respect. It deals in a clear manner with the general characters and structure of timber, passing from these subjects to a consideration of their properties and varieties, going so far as to provide simple means for easy identification. Then follows a chapter which has little to do, except indirectly, with the subject of the treatise, but is of great use to a proper understanding of the most vexed question in vegetable physiology, namely, the relations of the wood to the ascent of sap. It is, by all odds, the clearest *précis* that has yet appeared in this part of the field. At page 142, after these preparatory considerations have been presented, the diseases themselves are taken up in a systematic manner, and each is well considered. The book will be of use in the hands of every one who is interested in the care of trees, and especially to the students in our agricultural schools, to whom must be largely intrusted the intelligent supervision of our forests.

Cooper's 'Leather-Stocking Tales' have been compressed into one volume, for boys and girls, by dint of abridgment in parts not vital to the narrative (Geo. Routledge & Sons). Each of the five stories has its own pagination. The colored and other illustrations, being of foreign make, will not harmonize with current American pictures of the Indian and the trapper, but that is a small matter. The print is large and clear.

Harper & Brothers have issued still another—the sixth—number of the Franklin Square Song Collection, containing "two hundred favorite songs and hymns," of all countries and various periods, selected by J. P. McCaskey. There are also special school songs, and songs for young children, and interspersed with the text are various extracts and clippings on musical matters, not very happily chosen, and quite out of place in a collection of printed music. The type is clear and free from error, so far as we have examined it.

Mr. P. V. N. Myers has reduced by about one-half the bulk of his two books, 'Outlines' of Ancient and of Mediæval and Modern History, and published the condensed work under the title of 'A General History' (Ginn & Co.). The new publication is not wholly an abridgment, as much of the matter has been entirely rewritten. It follows the old works, however, very closely in spirit, style, and substance. These books are so readable and interesting that we can hardly conceive of any person finding them too long, unless for the purpose of *memoriter* recitation; if there is any demand for their abridgment, this thick volume will satisfy it. It has the same maps and for the most part the same illustrations as the earlier works.

The reputation of Duruy's 'Histoire de France' is so well established that the publication of an abridged translation (Crowell) would call for nothing more than a passing mention but that we wish to give due credit to Professor Jameson's introductory note (embodying a life of M. Duruy), and continuation, which brings the work down to the present year. The book is well printed, in rather small but clear type, and makes a volume of 706 pages. There is an abundance of excellent maps (reproduced from the original, with French names, etc.); none, however, we believe—for there is no list of them—which gives the present boundaries of France. There are an index, a rather meagre table of contents, and a few genealogical tables.

As a contribution to the much-talked-of iconographic catalogue, Prof. H. Carrington Bolton furnishes the November *Library Journal* with an index to scientific portraits in the *Popular Science Monthly*, vols. i.–xxxv.

The twelfth meeting of the Library Association of the United Kingdom, held in London Oct. 2–4, is in part reported in the November number of the *Library*. The address of the President, Chancellor Christie, a calm and sensible review of the "Work and Aims of the Library Association," and that of Melvil Dewey, on "Library Progress in America," are given in full. The remainder of the number is occupied by a summary of the proceedings and discussions. The papers read cover a much greater variety of topics than is usually found at the meetings of the sister association in this country. They range from those of an antiquarian or historical character, like Dr. Garnett's on "Some Colophons of the Early Printers," or Mr. Blades's on "Chained Libra-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ries," to such practical subjects as "A New Size Notation," "Free Libraries and Technical Education," etc. A paper on "Fiction in Libraries" started a lively but one-sided discussion, for all who spoke bore testimony to the value and utility of good healthy fiction.

The frontispiece of the New York *Photographic Times* of November 15 is an exceptionally good photogravure representing Milton's cottage at Chalfonte-St. Giles, in which the poet composed his 'Paradise Lost.' The picturesqueness of this refuge from the London plague has been well seized by an amateur photographer, who adds a brief account of his visit to this "box" which the Quaker Ellwood selected for his teacher.

The last four numbers of *L'Art* (Macmillan) have still mainly been preoccupied with the Exposition, and we may call attention in No. 607 to the description of the Javanese, Algerian, Tunisian, and other Eastern dances and plays which were among the genuine novelties of the wonderful show. In the same number will be found a long list of Troyon's works, indicating the disposition and prices of them at sales, etc. In No. 608 an obituary notice of the late Maurice Sand, son of Mme. Dudevant, is accompanied by a portrait. In the *Courrier de l'Art* for September 20, M. Adolphe Jullien reports the performance at the Palais de l'Industrie of Mlle. Holmès's spectacular and musical "Ode triomphale." He can praise it but faintly. What was remarkable was, that at the furthest distance from the scene the ear was better served than the eye. The *Courrier* calculates how much might have been done in producing unpublished works of the great French composers with the $60,000 placed at Mlle. Holmès's disposal; and every one must agree with it in regretting that the scheme of the Exposition did not include a retrospective musical exhibition.

In the October *Portfolio* we select for mention Mr. Hamerton's brief essay "On a Tendency in Contemporary Painting," viz., towards the abolition of thought, as in the tendency in French landscape painting to take extremely simple subjects, "till there is hardly any subject left. It seems in many cases as if the artist had nothing to communicate." Figure-painters, too, represent "the most commonplace personages in the most ordinary attitudes and occupations, with vulgar though appropriate surroundings." The series of papers on the monuments of Westminster Abbey is continued, and in the November number Longfellow's bust is enumerated with several other "odious little busts . . . which seem, so are they arranged, to be playing at hide-and-seek behind the columns." In this number, too, Mr. Burne-Jones is considered as a decorative artist, and numerous examples of his work are given.

All who know by tradition the fame of Jeremiah Mason as the foremost of New England lawyers perhaps of any period, will be glad to see in the *Green Bag* (Boston Book Company) a copy of his portrait which will go far to confirm his reputation for weight and wisdom.

The fourth number of the *National Geographic Magazine* is rich in papers, beginning with one on irrigation in California, by the State Engineer, Wm. H. Hall. A fragment of the great Atlas of the United States in progress illustrates Mr. Bailey Willis's brief geologic sketch, "Round about Asheville, N. C." "A Trip to Panama and Darien," by Richard V. Goode, accompanied by map and profile, and R. E. Peary's "Across Nicaragua with Transit and Meridian," with map and three colored views, are timely and readable.

Our readers will thank us for reminding them that the Atlas of New Jersey is obtainable in sheets at twenty-five cents each, carriage included, by addressing Mr. Irving S. Upson, New Brunswick, N. J., who will send a list of the twenty plates, showing the area covered by each.

The map of eastern equatorial Africa numbered 69 in the new 'Stieler's Hand-Atlas' (Westermann), is witness to the rapid march of African discovery, as the latest advices from Stanley show that both the original Nyanzas (the Albert lake being resolved into Albert and Albert Edward) must be redelineated. A southwestern extension of the Victoria Nyanza brings it much nearer to Lake Tanganyika.

In the little-known region which lies between the upper Nile and the Indian Ocean, occupied mainly by the Gallas on the north and the Masai on the south, is a chain of lakes, the largest of which is now known as Lake Rudolf, so named after the unfortunate Crown Prince of Austria. It has been conjectured that this lake, which has an area of about 3,000 square miles, was identical with Lake Samburu, and had an outlet belonging to the Nile system. This latter hypothesis, however, Ritter von Höhnel, who accompanied Count Teleki's expedition to this region, disproves in *Petermann's Mitteilungen* for October, while he throws grave doubts on the former. He states that none of the lakes, of which there are at least thirteen of considerable size, have outlets. They are further remarkable in that some contain fresh, others, not distant, salt water. This is followed by an account of the geology of the interesting valley of Orotava in Teneriffe, by Dr. A. Rothpletz. A supplemental number contains an account by Prof. J. Partsch of the Ionian Island of Leucadia, or Santa Maura.

The Geographical Society of Madrid has been publishing in its *Boletin* for this year a descriptive catalogue of the collection of maps and charts in the Royal Library. It contains also an account of the River Marañon and the Jesuit Mission in the Province of Quito, written in 1738 by one of the fathers, and hitherto unpublished.

The last *Bulletin* of the French Geographical Society contains the annual report on the progress of geography during the year 1888, by M. Ch. Maunoir. This is followed by an important paper, by Lieut.-Col. Gallieni, on the results of the campaign of 1887–88 in the western Sudan. From this we learn that the French possessions in that region, including Senegal and the protected countries, cover a little less than a hundred thousand square miles of territory having three millions of inhabitants. The paper is accompanied by an admirably clear map of the newly acquired "Soudan français."

The *Scottish Geographical Magazine* for November contains the conclusion of Dr. H. B. Guppy's investigations of the phenomena connected with the Keeling Atoll. From his observations and those of the proprietor of the island, Mr. Ross, he concludes that the atoll is filling up at about the average rate of a foot in a century, and that it has entered upon its final stage of existence, though it may still have 3,000 years of life before it. The whole existence of an atoll he estimates at from fifteen to twenty thousand years. In regard to Mr. Darwin's theory of its origin, he says: "Neither of upheaval nor of subsidence is there any evidence of an unequivocal character." The secretary, Mr. A. S. White, concludes his remarkable record of the geographical achievements of Scotchmen in the nineteenth century.

Mr. Arthur Gilman writes us from Cambridge: "There is a curious sentence in the *Popular Science Monthly* for October, 1889, on page 808. In an article on 'Industrial Family Names,' after remarks on the 'Butchers' and 'Slaughters,' it is said, 'But Fletcher and Flitcher need to be introduced as the lineal descendants of Flesher.' But doubtless the dictionaries are right, and Fletcher is *not* descended from 'Butchers' and 'Slaughters' at all, for it means a manufacturer of bows and arrows, as any one understanding French will easily see."

And Mr. Clarence Cook writes: "Another example of the use of the form 'fat' for 'vat' is found in Spenser in the 'Faerie Queene'—Book vii., Cantov ii.: the second of the Two Cantos of Mutabilitie. In stanza xxxix. we find:

> "'Then came October full of merry glee;
> For yet his noule was totty of the must,
> Which he was treading in the *wine-fats* see.'"

—The November issue of the *Magazine of American History* has a curious scrap from the New York *Gazette* of January 10, 1777. This ancient article is a narrative by a Tory, Dr. John Smith, of his being seized with Col. Connolly "in Frederick County, Maryland, over the Blue Ridge," and of their harsh treatment by Whig authorities. They were recruiting a regiment of Tories. The story leads one to inquire about Col. Connolly. Referring for information to Appletons' 'Dictionary of Biography,' one finds some statements which give him pause. It is said that "about 1798 Connolly conferred at Detroit with prominent citizens of the West with regard to the seizure of New Orleans, but that the attention of Washington was called to the subject, and measures were taken to prevent the execution of the plot." If the date 1798 is correct, there was no occasion for resort to Washington, for he was already a private citizen; Adams was in power. Again, in 1798, Detroit was utterly dissevered from New Orleans, and so could not have been a base of operations against it. It was beyond range altogether. If the writer in Appleton had looked into Craig's 'Olden Time,' he would have written 1790 instead of 1798, and substituted Kentucky for Detroit. He would also have learned that the ostensible object of Connolly's Kentucky visit was in regard to lands he had himself owned there, but which had been confiscated.

—The story of that confiscation is not told in 'Olden Time,' but it is worth telling. In 1780 it was decided by a jury, of whom Daniel Boone was one, at Lexington, Ky., that two thousand acres of which John Connolly was possessed on the Ohio at the Falls, were escheated for disloyalty to the State of Virginia. On this land most of the city of Louisville is now built, and it was the first land confiscated. But it had been before enacted that the first acres forfeited by Tories should be granted (eight thousand of them) to Transylvania University for its endowment. The connection of Connolly with southwestern lands has a further interest. In November, 1770, as Washington was returning from his voyage down the Ohio, though not so far as Kentucky, he notes in a pocket almanac, that in Pittsburgh he invited, among others, Dr. Connolly to dinner. He says he found him a very sensible, intelligent man, who had been up the Shawna (now the Cumberland) River nearly four hundred miles. From him he ascertained that its valley was an exceedingly desirable country, in respect of climate, streams, and level; fit for any kind of cultivation. Besides these natural advantages, game was so plenty as not only to render the importation of provisions (bread only excepted) altogether unnecessary, but to enrich adventurers with the peltry for which there was a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

constant and good market. Nothing out West seems to have pleased Washington better than what he thus heard about Kentucky—a region no part of which he ever saw. Its praises he must have blazoned abroad among his comrades in arms for whom he had largely made his journey, and whom he met in a sort of Grand Army reunion on his return. As a starting-point of occupancy, Connolly had mentioned the Falls of the Ohio, the site of his confiscated land. That Connolly should thus have pointed the way to what proved a land of more than promise for many Revolutionaries, and have provided a university endowment that is still effective, yet have lost everything himself, is among the notable ironies of history.

— The twentieth volume of Leslie Stephen's monumental 'Dictionary of National Biography' (Macmillan) ends with Thomas Garner. The contents are extremely varied and furnish exceptionally good reading. Charles James Fox has the longest notice (17 pages), while the Quaker George Fox, whose life (it might be argued) was more to England than the great orator's, gets but five pages; John Foxe (of the 'Book of Martyrs') gets nine. The editor is seen at his best in his ten-page notice of Sir Philip Francis, for whom he weighs the evidence identifying him with Junius, and adheres to that view; and in that of Thomas Fuller, on whose behalf he deprecates—as Charles Lamb might in his own case—the tedious and somewhat nauseating familiarity with which writers speak of him as "dear Thomas," or "quaint old Tom Fuller," etc. "His quick sense of the ridiculous," says Mr. Stephen, in summing up his character, "combined with a calm and cheerful temperament, made fanaticism impossible. It tempered his zeal instead of edging his animosities." Other biographies to be remarked are those of Bishop Gardiner and Gainsborough (six pages each), Sir John Franklin, Henry Fuseli, and William E. Forster, who is very fairly treated (about five pages each), Elizabeth Fry, "Alfred Crowquill" (Alfred Henry Forrester), Lady Holland, etc. Sir Bartle Frere finds an apologist. Lesser lights who did something to help the world forward are H. Fourdrinier, the inventor of the paper-making machinery bearing his name; John Fowler, inventor of the steam plough; Alexander John Forsyth, who struck out the principle of the percussion cap; Edward Forster, who introduced the bearded wheat from Smyrna; Sir Charles Fox, who introduced the railway switch; William Fox, founder of the Sunday-School Society; and Robert Were Fox, who determined by experiment the increase in the earth's heat from surface to centre.

—The American aspect of this instalment of the Dictionary is considerable, and at least two natives are commemorated—the Maryland Loyalist Joseph Galloway, and William Gardner, of Ohio, who gave the benefit of his inventiveness in fire-arms to the British, and died as late as 1887. Gen. Thomas Gage, and his contemporaries, Commodore Arthur Forrest, who found he could not introduce the press-gang into Boston without resistance even if with ultimate impunity, and Gen. Henry E. Fox, who fought at Bunker's Hill while his greater brother (as is pointed out) was opposing the war in Parliament, come together in this volume. Gen. Fox's son, still more curiously, Henry Stephen Fox, became British Minister to Washington, and died there in 1846. Others who came on peaceful errands were George Fox and his co-sectary William Forster, father of the Irish Secretary; but we cannot agree with the father's biographer in thinking that his healing a breach on the slavery question among the Indiana Friends was an illustration of the "right method of dealing with brethren in reference to such differences." The result of his peace-making was, of course, to the disadvantage of the come-outer anti-slavery element. Mention should also be made of the philanthropic Dr. John Fothergill, friend of the revolted colonies, of whom Franklin said, "I can hardly conceive that a better man has ever existed." And we will quote Mr. Geo. Ticknor's repartee to Lady Holland (Elizabeth Vassall Fox), when "she told him that she understood that New England had originally been a convict settlement, to which Ticknor answered that he was aware of the fact, but that in the King's Chapel, Boston, was a monument to one of the Vassalls, some of whom had been among the early settlers of Massachusetts."

—Nearly two years ago we noticed the English version of M. Henri Bouchot's 'Le Livre—L'Illustration—La Reliure,' styled 'The Printed Book: Its History, Illustration, and Adornment.' The edition having been exhausted, Mr. H. Grevel has taken it in hand, overhauling the awkward translation (though he might have gone further), and adding many new illustrations and a treatise on the art of collecting and describing early printed books, with a convenient Latin-English and English-Latin index of the principal towns where early printing-presses were established. The work has thus been much enlarged and transformed, and perhaps a new title was warranted. It is now called 'The Book: Its Printers, Illustrators and Binders from Gutenberg to the Present Time' (Scribner & Welford). We can repeat our praise of it as a general view of the growth of the art of book-making, and all the more because of the practical and sensible instructions for collecting incunabula. The English working over sometimes confuses the mind of the reader who thinks of its French origin. On p. 236 "our *Illustrated London News*" is spoken of. On p. 314 the Paris National Library is placed next to the British Museum in importance; on p. 318 its collection of printed books is admitted to outnumber that of the British Museum; and on these two pages the volumes are variously said to amount to 1,300,000, and to exceed two millions. Photographic facsimiles of the printers' book-marks, early engravings, letters, etc., would advantageously have replaced some of those here given by recutting; and as hardly any of the illustrations would not accommodate themselves to a duodecimo page, we could wish a smaller and more popular edition might be made. We are of opinion that when serious instruction is contemplated, the worst way to convey it is in *éditions de luxe*. A sprawling page is with difficulty comprehended and retained in the memory.

—The second and third parts of the 'Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften,' published by Gustav Fischer of Jena, extend from *Aktiengesellschaften* to *Arbeiterschutzgesetzgebung*, the length of these two words being in proportion to that of the articles which they designate, the former occupying ninety-two pages and the latter ninety-six; in fact, the article, or rather treatise, on legislation for the protection of workingmen is not quite completed, and will require a few more pages in Part 4. There are no other titles quite as long as these two, but even the shorter ones indicate that this work will far exceed in bulk and elaborateness of treatment any other existing publication on political economy. Thus, there is an article of thirty-three pages by Schäffle on Insurance against Old Age and Disability, with reference to another article, still to appear, on Compulsory Insurance for Workingmen; one of eighteen pages on Anarchism, in the bibliography of which it has an almost ludicrous effect to see Johann Most seriously cited as a writer; one of eighteen pages on Anthropology and Anthropometry, these two terms being both employed in a sense which, in English usage, belongs only to the latter; Schönberg writes ten pages on Labor, and the same number on Workingmen; eight pages are allowed to the Anti-Corn Law League; eleven to Apothecaries. Specifically American topics are Anti-renters, and a biographical paragraph on Prof. E. B. Andrews of Cornell (now President of Brown University). The closeness of the print, which was condemned as a fault in our notice of Part 1, has now been obviated, the page being greatly improved by being leaded. The publisher is entitled to double credit for this improvement: first, for paying heed to the remonstrances made to him, and secondly, for his liberality in doing it at his own cost, as he gives sixteen additional pages in each part without extra charge.

—In Stockholm has been issued, in a limited edition, a superb reproduction in photolithographic facsimile of the 'Vestgöta Lagbok,' at once the oldest Swedish provincial law and the oldest book in the Swedish language. The original MS., since 1780 in the Royal Library at Stockholm, dates, according to internal evidence, from the close of the thirteenth century. The codex originally consisted of forty-eight leaves, of which one, the second, has now been lost; it is written in two different hands. Twelve leaves in another (but apparently contemporaneous) hand were afterwards added; of these additional leaves the seventh has, however, been cut away down to a narrow strip, so that, as we have it here represented, the whole MS. consists of fifty-eight large octavo leaves. The facsimile gives the entire parchment page, with all its original imperfections and the subsequent discolorations and grime that are characteristic of the northern manuscripts. The margins, top, sides, and bottom contain frequent notes in various hands. In one place, on the wide margin of the bottom, are rude faces that have apparently been made by a child. The parchment has red and blue initials, which appear in the facsimile with the rest of the text in black, as it was impossible, say the editors, to reproduce them by photolithography in their original colors. Otherwise, we have an exact copy of the old Swedish MS. that to all intents and purposes will stand the student of Scandinavian palæography in quite as good stead as the prototype itself. This is by far the most successful attempt that has been made to reproduce in extended form the old Scandinavian vellums. The Arna Magnæan photolithographs—Valdemars Saellandske Lov, Elucidarius, and the Codex Runicus—are very far behind it in thoroughness and artistic excellence of workmanship. To complete the resemblance to a manuscript, the book is bound in parchment with thongs to tie the covers together.

CARTER ON CODIFICATION.

The Provinces of the Written and Unwritten Law. By James C. Carter, LL.D. Banks Brothers.

THE formal opposition to the Field Code in this State may be said to have been begun by Mr. Albert Mathews in an able essay on Codification which the Bar Association had printed in 1881. The Code had been suddenly sprung

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the community and on the bar in the winter of 1879, after lying unnoticed for fourteen years. It was then passed by the Legislature, and vetoed by Gov. Robinson. Since then the attempt to enact it has been renewed regularly every year until this year, and defeated only by extraordinary exertions on the part of a few lawyers who were deeply impressed by the prospect of confusion which it seemed to open up. Of these opponents of the Code, Mr. James C. Carter has been the most prominent. Indeed, it may be said that it is to him that we owe the defeat of the last two efforts to pass it. He began his operations against it by a paper prepared at the request of the Bar Association in 1884, and printed and circulated by them, on the "Proposed Codification of Our Common Law," which was a somewhat elaborate discussion not only of the Field Code, but of codification in general, and of the possibility of its application to the common law in this State.

Within the past year he has taken up the same subject, in its more philosophical aspect in the pamphlet which lies before us, containing an address delivered to the Virginia Bar Association in July last. In this he goes into the general question whether it is possible in any civilized community to embody satisfactorily in a code what he calls Private Law, or the law which regulates the transactions of the members of the community with each other, as distinguished from Public Law, or the law which regulates the affairs of the community in its corporate character. The first, he maintains, must always remain, for the most part, unwritten—*i. e.*, uncodified. The latter must needs be written, and it may be codified. The community, that is to say, must always embody in statutes its will regarding the transaction of its own business as a community, but must leave the regulation of the transactions of individuals with each other to the judges, because with regard to these latter the community cannot have any will except that justice should be done in each case as it arises, within certain great lines traced by "public policy."

The codifiers practically maintain that they can provide beforehand a rule of decision which shall cover every dispute that can arise in the courts, or at all events can come sufficiently near covering it to enable any plain man to discover, with a fair approach to certainty, what are his rights under the law before he goes into court at all, and which shall remove the ordinary affairs of men from under what they consider a great social bane, the discretion of the judges. The defenders of "judge-made law" maintain, on the other hand, that all, or nearly all, controversies which come up for judicial settlement are due to novelty in the combination of facts which make up the case; that if the facts of every dispute were exactly similar, there would hardly be any need of courts at all, and the laws of a community might consist of a few rules which could be put into a duodecimo volume, like a civil-engineer's manual, containing formulæ for the solution of every possible difference between men, to be found by reference to the index.

But it is because the combination of facts in a controversy between individuals almost always differs in some degree from the combination in previous controversies in the same field, that men go to law at all. Parties to a law-suit almost always agree in seeking justice. The question between them on which courts are called on to pass is, What is justice in this particular instance? Men's dealings with their fellow-men display almost as much variety as men's faces. Most transactions have some distinguishing feature, however slight, and it is over this distinguishing feature they quarrel and appeal to the law. The codifiers say: "No matter what your distinguishing feature may be, we shall have a rule ready for it." The common lawyers say: "This is as absurd as it would be to pretend to foresee and put on paper in the beginning of a year all the bargains, in all their details, which men will make in real estate, in cotton, in corn, in iron, in wool, in shipping, in partnerships, in home and foreign exchange, in insurance, in railroads and navigation. No matter how bulky or minute you make your code, that old rule of human affairs which makes the unforeseen the thing most likely to happen, will defeat your precautions. Modern business in its jural aspect is a kaleidoscope. New combinations will arise which your code will not cover to the satisfaction of the parties, and you will have to appeal to the judge to interpret your code. This has been the history of all codes: it will be the history of codes to the end of the world. The more complex and multifarious the transactions of civilized men become, the more futile will appear the attempt to deal with them through a body of statute law."

The controversy is a very old one, and was first brought to an acute stage in England, and in Anglo-Saxon countries generally, by the attacks of Bentham on the common law, and has been stimulated in our own day by two agencies which have little or no connection with jurisprudence. One is the love of modern democracies for settling everything through representative legislatures; the other is the distrust of modern democracies for authority which they have had no hand in creating. The first of these has developed that excessive legislative activity which has become at once the burden and shame of nearly every free country in our day, and which nearly every free country is trying, by one expedient or another, to abate. The other has brought on the political stage that great bugbear of modern political philosophers, the elective judge, with his insecure tenure, his subservience to political managers, and deference for waves of popular feeling. His faults nobody denies, but he nevertheless figures in the programme of the Radicals in every country in the world. We have long had him here. It is with great difficulty he has been kept off the bench in France during the past twenty years. He would probably come soon in Ireland under Home Rule, and, though not a near or perhaps very conspicuous danger, he is one of the dangers of the political future in England. The awful character of the judge, as it has come down to us from the remote antiquity, who fears neither the tyrant's frown nor the clamors of the mob, does not any longer impress the popular imagination with the old reverence. Modern democracy is disposed to consider the judge simply as a man laying down the law without adequate authority or proper responsibility, who needs much supervision and constant reminders of his dependence. Consequently, schemes like codification for restricting his discretion, lowering his authority, and diminishing the importance of his integrity and learning, find a readier acceptance now than ever before.

No one can, we think, read Mr. Carter's pamphlet, however, without being deeply impressed with the fact that the judge is sure to play a greater part in the world hereafter than ever heretofore, and that the most important of the preparations which Democracy has to make for its millennium, is to magnify his authority, fortify his character, and increase the guarantees of his independence. For to him, and to no one else, as human affairs increase in complexity under the growth of our civilization, must we look for the discovery and expression of justice as the community sees and understands it.

But what is justice? Mr. Carter, unfortunately, as we think, for his purpose, gives some countenance to the notion that there is something called "abstract and absolute justice which human reason will never reach, but after which it for ever aspires," a "hidden reality," but still a "reality." There may be such an abstraction, but it is safe to call it inconceivable. Justice is a purely human creation. It can only be produced in human society and for the purposes of human society. There is for a solitary man no such thing as justice. Justice makes its appearance only when the community consists of two individuals at least. For Robinson Crusoe there was no such thing as justice until he was joined by his man Friday. It is the rule of action prescribed by social morality, in answer to the question raised by every state of facts which requires something to be done by somebody. This question is, What is to be done, and who is to do it? It is this question which is submitted to every judge who is called on to decide a case.

The true answer to this question always is, that justice is what the bulk of men comprising the community would think fair and right. The judge searches for the rule in the customs and social ideals of the people among whom he lives. Abstract or absolute justice is no more his concern than abstract or absolute beauty. The original source of justice was probably the passion for equality of rights and privileges which is the earliest social sentiment of all gregarious animals, man included. Society is not possible without equality as a fundamental assumption. That each is entitled to as much as any other of whatever good is going, and must submit to as much as any other of whatever evil is to be endured, is a postulate necessary to the permanent constitution of even a wild herd or pack. The idea of justice thus generated is of course profoundly modified in practice as time goes on by differences of force, of capacity, by accidents of birth, or by achievement, but it always and everywhere governs the judicial decisions of controversies. It makes it the aim of the judge to put the parties as far as possible in a position of equality of advantage or disadvantage. The just man remains always the man who keeps his contracts and satisfies reasonable expectations which his language and conduct have created, and abstains from depriving his neighbor of any share of the general good to which he is reasonably entitled.

It is in the search of the judge after this (it may be local) standard of justice or rule of right, to be applied to the particular facts before him, that private law, or the law regulating the transactions of individuals, is created. Mr. Carter's thesis is that it cannot be created in any other way; that private law must on the whole be "judge-made law"; that the modern world can no more escape from this mode of legislation than it can escape from the use of astronomy in navigation; that the office of judge, far from losing its importance, grows more important every day; that the art of man cannot devise a substitute for it, and that what most of all needs to be taught in our law schools is, that, in witnessing the decision of a case in court by a competent bench, we are witnessing the actual creation of the law by the extraction from the customs and morality of the community of the justice of this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

particular case. His exposition of this point is a model of clear and forcible argumentation, and there is no lawyer or law student, legislator or politician, in the country who ought not to ponder it.

There is in the commercial history of our own time one bit of corroboration or illustration of his thesis which Mr. Carter does not mention, but which is both strong and illuminating. It is the fact—for fact we believe it to be—that the practice of referring disputes to the arbitration of men in the same business has greatly grown in all the leading trades, industries, and commercial bodies; so much, indeed, as to diminish seriously, as all lawyers admit, the volume of litigation coming before the courts. Now, what does this arbitration mean? It means resort to the exact process which goes on in all our courts when a case is submitted to a judge or jury—that is, the imposition on fair-minded men, familiar with the moralities and usages of the business in which the transaction in dispute has taken place, of the task of extracting from these moralities and usages the particular rule of justice applicable to the particular combination of facts which is laid before them. We venture to say that if the Chamber of Commerce, the Stock Exchange, or the Produce Exchange, or any other commercial or industrial corporation were asked whether they could not draft a code which would make arbitration unnecessary, by furnishing a rule of settlement for every possible dispute among their members, they would consider the question childish, and we say this while remembering that small branches of business, like bills of exchange, have been brought under the rule of a code in England.

A NEW YORKER OF THE TRANSITION PERIOD.

The Diary of Philip Hone. 1828–1851. Edited, with an introduction, by Bayard Tuckerman. 2 vols. Dodd, Mead & Co. 1889.

THE story of Mr. Hone's life is briefly told in Mr. Tuckerman's introduction. He was born in 1780 and died in 1851. With a common-school education, he became a clerk in his brother's business at the age of seventeen, and, two years later, was admitted to the firm. In 1820 he retired from business with a fortune ample for those days. After an extended tour in Europe, he came home and settled down to a life of domestic happiness, social pleasure, amateurish politics, and public usefulness. His politics were largely ornamental. He was Assistant Alderman from 1824 to 1826, and then Mayor for one term. Later, he attempted to secure a State Senatorial election, but was overwhelmingly defeated. In his old age he was made Naval Officer under Taylor's Administration, his necessities having become as eloquent as his services. As a Whig Mr. Hone was badly situated in New York for political advancement. He was in much request as a presiding officer and for the handsome entertainment of Webster and other statesmen, a business for which his predilection was immense. He was a trustee of the first savings-bank in New York, and as trustee and president served it for more than forty years. He was trustee or director or president of a whole page of different institutions, mercantile, charitable, educational, and social, and it would appear that he had a conscience for the responsibilities that he assumed. Board meetings found him always present, even though the social dinners that he dearly loved had to be given up.

He did the thing which Wendell Phillips thought added a new terror to death: he kept a diary. He began it in 1828, professedly for his own future satisfaction and his children's; but there is something which suggests anticipation of a wider reading. Though he does not mention Pepys or Evelyn, those famous diarists were probably before his eyes. He would fain do for nineteenth-century New York what they did for seventeenth-century London. But his field was much less various than theirs, and then he had not their literary touch, still less the ingenuous absurdity of the less important but more interesting of the ancient pair. He was a man of mediocre talents, thoroughly respectable, moving for the most part in a round of feeble personalities and small affairs, saying a good many flat and stupid things in an extremely solemn way, having much of that gravity which Rochefoucauld described as a mysterious carriage of the body invented to conceal the defects of the mind. His diary was ample, filling twenty-eight quarto volumes. On May 1, 1851, he questioned whether he should begin another which was ready to his hand, and three days afterwards he died.

Mr. Tuckerman has not given us more than a quarter of the original, and if his selection had been more severe, it would have been improved. The omissions are of comments on new books with extracts from them—means of self-improvement in which Mr. Hone had patient confidence—summaries of foreign news brought by the packet ships, political statistics, records of political meetings, extracts from the speeches of public men and articles of current interest, particulars of journeys made for business or for pleasure. The parts retained relate to industrial changes, to political and social life, to public men and other individuals of note, and to the history of the city of New York. The parts relating to industrial and local changes are the most interesting and valuable.

Beyond the statement of mere facts, Mr. Hone's ability went but a little way. He was no Boswell. From his conversation with distinguished men he brought away nothing but a vague impression of their brilliancy or pleasantness. He dined with Daniel Webster scores of times, and he was always charmed and satisfied with him, but of the good things that he said he does not tell us one. A single conversation is reported, bearing upon Webster's use of wine. Christopher Gore put him up to it, he said, to improve his health; the auxiliary had proved worse than the enemy. Whether Webster gave Dr. Johnson credit for this happy phrase we are not told. It would have been well if Mr. Tuckerman's editing had been more exact as well as more compressive. In that case we should not have had Marcey for Marcy (vol. i., p. 49), nor Buckley for Bulkeley—Emerson's first Concord ancestor (vol. i., p. 162), nor Garrett Smith for Gerrit (vol. i., p. 326, and in the index); nor Binney for Birney (vol. ii., p. 236); nor Rhynders for Rynders (vol. ii., p. 395). Nor should we have had Montgomery's beautiful hymn, "Prayer is the soul's sincere desire," printed at the end of the journal as if it were Mr. Hone's, with many words misquoted, the stanzas transposed, and four stanzas from another hymn tacked on, as if they were a part of it.

One of the most general impressions which the Diary makes is that of the provincialism of New York during the entire period which it covers, compared with the city of to-day. Another is that of its æsthetic poverty. Mr. Hone was a diligent recorder of Academy exhibitions, and he names the pictures that elicited his admiration. We are made present at the birth of Cole's "Voyage of Life," and listen with some incredulity to Mr. Hone's prophecy of its endless fame. His dinner parties must have been very pleasant, but we get little more from them than the names of those who sat down. Chancellor Kent was often one of these, and Mr. Hone's loyal and affectionate admiration for him reflects his genial character. Once Fanny Kemble came to dine, and a few years afterwards told all about the dinner in a book. It was done most cruelly, but it gives us an idea how different Mr. Hone's other dinners might have seemed to us if Fanny Kemble, or some other equally vivacious and malicious spirit, had reported them. Mr. Hone makes a running commentary on her comments, forgiving her much for her praise of his daughter Mary, "with a smile that was not to say a ray, but a whole focus of sun-rays—a perfect blaze of light," but rebutting much, with pathetic loyalty to his friends. He is, however, able to say that she herself made but a poor impression, and a previous entry witnesses the fact.

The domestic establishment of Mr. Hone must have been upon a generous scale. In 1835 he lays in his winter butter, four to five hundred pounds at $2.14 a pound! For this extravagant price, as for the hard times generally of this and the immediately succeeding years, Mr. Hone holds Andrew Jackson's meddling with the Bank responsible. His disrespect for Jackson was exceedingly pronounced; only for his nullification proclamation does he give him any praise. Personal friendship qualified his political hatred of his successor. The shiftiness of party lines while the Whig and Democratic parties were in process of formation comes out very strongly. As between Clay and Webster, Mr. Hone's admiration was divided, with a leaning to the Webster side: he knew the latter statesman so much better. He furnishes us with a good example of the Whig mind in its relation to the slavery question. The Southern protagonists of slavery and the Northern abolitionists are to him equally deplorable, and he often confounds with the latter both Liberty Party men and Free-Soilers. He liked to spice his diary with duels and with mobs, so that a great many pro-slavery mobbings of anti-slavery people are set down, sometimes in terms much more amusing than his deliberate humor. At the burning of Pennsylvania Hall in Philadelphia, the mob, it seems, was "instigated by the wanton outrage of public opinion in the exhibition in the public streets of white men and women walking arm-in-arm with blacks, and by their speeches the females were foremost in arousing the excited populace." We must give Mr. Hone credit for seeing as clearly as Calhoun or Garrison the disunion result of the conflict. He was also quick to apprehend the meaning of the Irish invasion of New York. It seems almost premature to find him writing in 1835, and in italics, "These Irishmen . . . *decide the elections in the city of New York.*" His irritation with the abolitionists makes him sometimes forget himself, as where he speaks of "that ass Lewis Tappan." For Bennett of the *Herald* he has never a good word, but some of his characterizations vary as events proceed. John Quincy Adams is "crazy" and "a fox" in 1841; a little later he is a "sturdy mastiff"; and still later he is that "glorious old man." That the conscience Whigs had some disunion sentiments between the first of these entries and the last may have softened his judgment. His impression of Adams's universal knowledge was profound. Once breakfasting with Mr. Hone and Webster, he plunged into a disquisition upon dancing girls

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED